

THE SATURDAY REVIEW OR POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 971, Vol. 37.

June 6, 1874.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

M. GAMBETTA AT AUXERRE.

M. GAMBETTA has many enemies and few friends. His enemies are to be found in every section of Paris society, and in almost every fraction of the Assembly. His friends are a few personal adherents who are never sure what he will do, and who are jealous of the private consolations which, rightly or wrongly, he is generally believed to have brought with him out of the disasters of 1870. But it must be owned that he alone among the Frenchmen of his generation knows what to do in furtherance of his views, and when to do it. The time, he considered, had come for him to make an appeal to France; but to make an appeal to France is as difficult a feat as any one could in the present state of things undertake to perform. He is a deputy, and may nominally say what he pleases in the Assembly; but it is only in the sense in which a man may say what he pleases in a bear-garden. He might of course get a deputation from French residents in the Lebanon or Japan to call on him, and give or promise him an inkstand, and then he could give them at least a possible inkstand's worth of political disquisition. Or he might write a letter to himself in his own newspaper. But he knows his country too well to adopt such quiet machinery, and is aware that if he wants to make a sensation, he must begin with something sensational. To have spoken when he ought not to have spoken, to outwit the Government, and beard a Prefect were necessary theatrical strokes if he wished to arrest the attention of his countrymen. It happened that there was to be an agricultural banquet at Auxerre, in the department of the Yonne, and this seemed to him to offer just the opportunity he wanted. No one would dream of the great GAMBETTA dropping down, as if out of his famous balloon, at a quiet little place like Auxerre, or of a banquet of farmers being turned into a vehicle for the exposition of the true principles of modern democracy. Auxerre had also two special recommendations. It was there that the late EMPEROR made one of his most characteristic speeches just before Sadowa introduced the era of his disasters; and as M. GAMBETTA wished, above all things, to speak his mind as to Imperialism, and as Auxerre had been made famous by having Imperialism preached and praised there by its illustrious champion, the effect would be striking if it were also made the scene of as bitter a demonstration against Imperialism as M. GAMBETTA could devise. At Auxerre it also happened that there reigned a Prefect who owed his first rise in the world to the Government of the 4th of September, and M. GAMBETTA rightly calculated that an official would be easily bewildered by the sudden appearance of one of the patrons he had thrown over. The miserable Prefect telegraphed, in an agony of anxiety, to Paris for instructions; but, happily, the Marshal and the MINISTER of the INTERIOR were engaged in honouring with their presence a wedding dinner, and before they could be got to attend to business GAMBETTA had made his speech, it had been taken down, and its publicity throughout France had been ensured. The young lady who had been occupying her day with making some one happy or unhappy for life little thought of the connexion which fate had decreed should exist between her veil and wreath and the political destinies of her country. But, like many other persons who have done big things in history, she accomplished an important act without having the slightest intention of accomplishing it. She gave GAMBETTA time to speak. This would have been of no moment whatever

unless he had had something really to say when he got the opportunity. But he had things to say which France will find it highly worth while to think over carefully. He had to sketch and, so far as possible, to determine the policy of the Republican party; and he had to give a distinct challenge to Imperialism, and tell the country that, if it did not wish to fall into the hands of Bonapartist intriguers, it must frankly accept the Republic.

M. GAMBETTA, like many other men who have made their mark in the world, has two distinct sides to his character. He is at once prudent and impulsive. He can be patient and vigilant, can slowly mature his ideas, and can wait inactive until the hour of action comes. This was the side of his nature which he showed in his sketch of the Republican programme. He is also vehement, passionate, a thoroughly good hater, in short, the *fou furieux* of M. THIERS's well-known saying. This side of his nature he displayed when he came to his invective against the Imperialists; and it certainly is an advantage that when a man wants to give a warning he should be able to give it in very plain terms, and that when he wants to curse he should have a natural turn for strong language and a fine command of expletives. His Republican programme was the embodiment of Republican good sense. His party has two great obstacles to encounter—the alarm it inspires, and the elements of which it is composed. To persuade France that the Republic is a safe, steady, prosaic, honourable form of government, and to persuade his party that it must abandon the attitude of a fanatical narrow-minded clique, were the two things which M. GAMBETTA was aware that he had to do if he wished to achieve a real success. He himself, some little time ago, had added to the alarm which the name and recollection of the Republic inspire by a statement that new *couches sociales* had been formed in France, the existence and importance of which must be recognized. Fresh from the memory of the Commune, France was perfectly ready to own that the existence of new *couches sociales* had been revealed to it, but it thought that to keep them down with bullet and bayonet was a much better way of treating them than to bestow on them an admiring recognition. M. GAMBETTA saw how desirable it was that he should give a satisfactory meaning to his well-known words. To ignore them would be either to confess that he had been wrong in using them, or to incur the suspicion that he was keeping something back, and had a Red Republicanism in reserve behind the rose-coloured Republicanism which he was expounding. In the most natural way possible, and as if no one ought ever to have misunderstood him, he affixed a meaning to his utterances about new *couches sociales* which was not only inoffensive but reassuring. In the last twenty years material prosperity has, he said, placed wealth, or something like wealth, in hands to which it was formerly a stranger. The number of petty landowners has increased, and those who now own small plots of land are better off than their predecessors used to be. It was these excellent, thrifty, intelligent proprietors, these sober men of small means, whom he begged leave to designate as new *couches sociales*; and what he understood by recognizing them was merely that they should be allowed and encouraged to manage their own affairs, instead of having everything done for them by a despotic Government. The Republic was, he said, the only form of government that would allow them to associate themselves actively with the progress of the nation; and a form of government that allowed this was not one of which any honest man need be afraid. But if the Republic is to be the Government of France, the Republic must be something much

wider than the old Republican party, with its principles of 1789, and its blessed memories of 1793, and its cast-iron traditions—everything, in fact, that M. GAMBETTA believed in as all-sufficient when he was the hero of the Government of the 4th of September. It must become the party carrying on, and practically fitted to carry on, the daily government of a country which is ashamed of much in its past, and afraid of much in its future. It must welcome all who are willing to join it. As M. GAMBETTA lately said in the course of a funeral oration, it must recognize that even such poor creatures as noblemen ought not to be totally excluded from public life. M. GAMBETTA has even gone so far as to mention names, and has selected the Duke of AUDIFFRET-PASQUIER as an instance of the sort of man who must be invited to help in guiding the fortunes of a Republic, if a Republic is to be firmly established. This is a very new style of language in the mouth of a Republican leader, but it is as wise as it is new, and nothing could more tend to establish and confirm the importance of M. GAMBETTA's political position than that he should have been the first to recognize and insist on the necessity of enlarging the bounds of the party to which he belongs.

When the EMPEROR was at Auxerre he informed his delighted hearers that he had a debt to pay to the department of the Yonne, as it had been one of the first to give him its suffrage in 1848, because it knew that its interests were identified with those of the EMPEROR. He further assured the inhabitants of Auxerre that in their midst he could breathe at ease, as it was among the laborious populations and rural districts that he found the true genius of France. M. GAMBETTA strove to impress on the audience at Auxerre which he had audaciously taken by storm, that if the inhabitants of Auxerre had enabled the EMPEROR to breathe at ease, he certainly had not returned the compliment, and had left them to breathe in a very uneasy manner in 1870. Of course M. GAMBETTA was not likely to let the EMPEROR have all the merit of praising people who dwell in small towns and country districts; and it was by their virtues and intelligence that his new *couches sociales* had, in his opinion, deserved to be cordially and handsomely recognized. But it throws some light on the intelligence of the *couches sociales* and of the laborious populations in which the EMPEROR found the true genius of France, to discover that one of the main difficulties with which M. GAMBETTA has to contend is that Bonapartist agents have undertaken to persuade the French peasants that Sedan was fought and lost after the 4th of September, and that this crushing defeat was entirely due to the scandalous incompetence of the Republican Government. It is impossible for the Republicans to encounter the Imperialists with their own weapons, for this is the biggest lie that could be told; and so the Bonapartists have got possession of the field of mendacity, which in a struggle of French politicians is a matter of very great moment. Will the French peasants, then, M. GAMBETTA asks, listen to the truth? This is his last hope, but he does not affect to conceal that he is very much alarmed. Everything else is impossible, as he truly says, except democratic Caesarism and the Republic; and he knows that the decision will lie not so much with the nation as with the group of wavering politicians who form the two Centres, and especially the Right Centre, of the Assembly. Will there be a dissolution or an appeal to the people by a plebiscite? M. GAMBETTA sees that, according as Marshal MACMAHON is pressed by those who have his ear, to take the one or the other of these alternatives, the Republic or the Empire, will be the issue; and, while there is yet time, M. GAMBETTA raises his voice and loudly calls on his countrymen, and especially on those who used to oppose the Second Empire, in the name of political liberty, to realize how easily force and intrigue may win, and the country be handed over once more to the wire-pullers of a system which has, as M. GAMBETTA thinks, plunged it in ruin and disgrace.

MR. ANDERSON'S MOTION.

MR. ANDERSON on Tuesday last confused two or three distinct issues in his speech and motion on the claims of British subjects arising out of the American war. In a clear and able statement Mr. BOURKE showed that certain claims against the United States are not barred by the Washington Treaty or by the proceedings of the Commission, and that English subjects who suffered by the acts of the

Alabama and other Confederate cruisers have no claim for redress at the hands of their own Government. There is apparently still no sufficient ground for hoping to have heard the last of the unpalatable subject of the Treaty and the Arbitration; but persevering members of Parliament, such as Mr. ANDERSON, may reasonably be expected to abstain from giving an exaggerated scope to a perverse decision. The allegation that "Great Britain had been adjudicated to have been in the wrong in permitting the 'escape of the *Alabama*" is inaccurate, although it is possible that the arbitrators might have invented a new doctrine of international law to the disadvantage of neutrals if the English negotiators of the Treaty had not supplied them with new rules which, by a strained interpretation, enabled them to award damages to the United States. The members of the Tribunal not unnaturally assumed that they were expected to decide against a litigant who had apparently taken pains to render an adverse verdict possible; but even at Geneva it would have been difficult to argue that a nation had been in the wrong because it had not conformed to rules which were invented several years after the date of the pretended offence. Mr. ANDERSON praised the late Government for its prudence in submitting to arbitration on the trite and paradoxical ground that there is more true courage in yielding than in fighting. If courage is successively used in opposite senses in the two members of an antithetic proposition, nothing is easier than to show that it is best proved by a display of timidity; but it is not worth while to revive an obsolete and disagreeable controversy. The Treaty and the Award made it necessary to compensate American citizens for losses suffered through the acts of Confederate cruisers. The damages were assessed on evidence presented by the United States; and they were paid to the Government, and not to private claimants. The right to compensation was founded exclusively on international law as it was laid down and applied by the Geneva Tribunal. Only the two contending Governments could be affected by the reference or the award.

English owners of cargoes destroyed by the *Alabama* can have no possible claim to compensation from their own Government. They were neither directly nor indirectly parties to the Washington Treaty, and payment of their losses would amount to an admission of the absurd and popular American statement that the *Alabama* was really an English cruiser. They might indeed have probably sustained a claim against the Confederacy, which would have been supported by the good offices of the English Government. According to the ancient maritime law, neutral goods in an enemy's ship were exempt from capture; and if Mr. BOURKE is right in saying that the Confederate Government was not bound by the rules annexed to the Treaty of Paris, Captain SEMMES committed a wrong act in destroying English cargoes. The English Government would be morally liable for injuries inflicted by its vessels of war on private traders; but, as Mr. BOURKE said, it would be absurd that compensation should be granted at the public expense for losses suffered through burglary or piracy. Colonel MURE, in seconding Mr. ANDERSON's motion, urged the House to deal with the question as one rather of national justice and equity than of law; but neither the Government nor Parliament is morally justified in applying the national funds to gratuitous benevolence. Mr. ANDERSON, as if for the purpose of inviting defeat, had framed his motion in the most offensive terms, when he referred to "individual subjects who had suffered a severe 'loss through a national wrong.'" No national wrong had, in fact, been committed; and at the worst it could only have been perpetrated against the United States. The shippers of goods in American vessels knew the risks which they incurred, and they must be taken to have looked to the Confederate Government for compensation on account of any injury which might be inflicted by its cruisers. The debtor has unluckily failed and disappeared; and it is idle to attempt to fix the English Government with the liabilities of a State which never even obtained recognition. Neither Mr. ANDERSON nor Mr. BOURKE explained the nature of the assurances which were supposed to have been given to the shippers by the able and experienced Consul at New York. Mr. ARCHIBALD may perhaps have informed those who consulted him that neutral goods were legally exempt from capture; but he certainly never guaranteed the strict observance of international law by the Confederate officers.

There are still outstanding claims which could not, according to the terms of the Treaty, be presented to the Commission which sat at Washington. It seems that in

the discussions preliminary to the Treaty the United States Commissioners insisted on describing the late contest as a rebellion, although their own Government and their courts of justice had for three or four years recognized the existence of a state of civil war. The English Commissioners had for once sufficient firmness to resist a pretension which was utterly inconsistent with the blockades and captures instituted and effected by the American navy, and which implied that those who dealt with the Confederates as belligerents were consciously abetting rebellion. Eventually, the question was evaded by a substitution of dates for definitions; and it seemed good to the representatives of the United States to assume that peace had been restored on the 9th of April, 1865, when General LEE surrendered. For purposes of domestic litigation, the Government of the United States fixed the 20th of August as the date of the end of the war, and it happened that between April and August several English subjects suffered loss through military operations. Under the terms of the Treaty all claims of the kind were rejected by the Washington Commission, and perhaps the framers of the Treaty had hoped that English sufferers would be absolutely deprived of redress. If such was their intention in fixing the premature date, they may perhaps be disappointed. It is evident that the Treaty and the awards can only operate as a bar to claims which were preferred, or which might have been preferred, to the Commission. All previous and subsequent claims retain any validity which they may have originally possessed, and the PRESIDENT of the United States has recommended the appointment of a Court or Commission for the determination of all claims of aliens on the United States for losses suffered during the Civil War, or, as General GRANT calls it, the insurrection. In his Message the PRESIDENT expressly states that there are English claims arising after the date fixed by the Treaty, and that there are also claims advanced by citizens or subjects of other Powers. A Bill has been introduced into Congress in accordance with the PRESIDENT's recommendations, and probably some measure of the kind will shortly be passed. It would have been more convenient to have brought all English claims before the Commission; but any court which may be established will probably be as favourable to suitors as the mixed Commission. Even if Congress should fail to establish a special Court for the purpose, the claims will survive; and they will be pressed by all usual methods on the attention of the Government of the United States.

One among three classes of claims which were discussed by Mr. ANDERSON is already disposed of. The Government of the United States has successfully objected to compensate either aliens or American citizens for losses of vessels caused by the acts of the Confederates. Mr. ANDERSON may perhaps be justified in contending that the American Government would be liable if it were right in describing the war as a rebellion; but, in fact, the Federal authorities were powerless to protect property in the Confederate States; and it is scarcely to be expected that they should adopt the liabilities of the hostile Government. The Commission has affirmed the immunity of the Federal Government; and it is useless to attempt to reopen the question. The hardships suffered by a foreign resident in a country which becomes the seat of war may deserve abundant compassion, but they are sometimes irremediable. There is some hope of redress from an established Government which may in the course of military operations destroy the property of a foreigner, but the loss is necessarily final when the Government which is liable has itself ceased to exist. Whatever may be the merits of the controversy, the English Government is bound by the judgment of the Commission. If it proves to be true that public opinion in the United States inclines to compensation for losses suffered by loyal citizens in the Confederate States, it is perhaps barely possible that by a liberal construction aliens also may obtain a share of redress. Some recent visitors to America have persuaded themselves that the better part of the community now feels a kind of remorse for the violence and sharp practice which characterized the *Alabama* litigation. It is even conjectured that, when a future dispute arises, the people of the United States will exhibit a good will and generosity which will undoubtedly surprise their opponents. If repentance both exists, and takes the form of pecuniary liberality, Mr. ANDERSON's clients may perhaps, after all, obtain compensation.

THE ARMY.

NOTHING can exceed the prudence, the caution, the anxiety to avoid grand statements, and the courtesy towards their late opponents, which the leading members of the present Cabinet have shown since their accession to office. But the minor members of the Ministry cannot so quickly adopt what seems to them a perfectly newfangled, absurd, and un-Conservative way of talking and acting. They remember how very few months it is since they were encouraged by the most eminent party authorities to declare that the wretched Liberals had mismanaged everything and hurried the country to the dogs. Mr. WARD HUNT had to be quietly recalled to his senses and disciplined into harmony with the rest of the Cabinet by Sir STAFFORD NORTH-COTE. The IRISH SECRETARY had his fling at the Land and Church Acts, which his friends had denounced as measures of spoliation, only to find that he must learn to throw the veil of official reticence over his feelings, and accept all the acts of the late Government as the basis on which he was to stand. More recently, Lord EUSTACE CECIL, cheered by a meeting held to celebrate a Conservative triumph, and seeing none but honest Conservative faces round him, fancied that he might once more talk in the dear old Conservative strain. He is now in office as Surveyor-General of the Ordnance, and it was therefore with extreme pleasure that he could at once pitch into the Liberals and seem to speak with peculiar and official authority, when he vowed that the legacy left by the Liberal party was simply appalling whether his eager hearers looked at the recruiting, the brigade depot centres, or the reserves; but he begged his friends to believe that a good time had come at last, and that Mr. HARDY was not the man to countenance dummy regiments or phantom reserves. A few days later the Duke of RICHMOND had to speak on a military question in the House of Lords, and the difference between the tone of the leader of the party and that of the subordinate was comically great. Mr. HARDY, he assured the House, was far too wise to make any rash changes; all he could be said to have done at present was to study the elements of his new business, and he did not know whether any or what changes might ultimately seem advisable to him. That a Conservative official should really have to examine impartially and carefully what a Liberal official has done is naturally inconceivable to an impulsive aspirant, but it is forced on his leaders, and is willingly accepted by them as the first of their new duties. Caution in upsetting any existing arrangements without weighing the consequences of the course taken is, indeed, the general tone of both Houses of Parliament as regards the army and many other matters. Mr. McCULLAGH TORRENS's motion for an address to the Crown praying that all officers forced to quit the service should be entitled to claim a court-martial before obeying met with no acceptance in the Commons. The common sense argument was insuperable, that the highest authorities must be trusted not to do injustice, and that, if the army is to be in a sound state, there must be some way in which incompetent officers or men who are doing harm to the credit and character of a regiment should be quietly got rid of without scandal or exposure. The temper of the times is not one which leads men high in office to bear unjustly on individuals. A more remarkable instance of this could scarcely be found than in the appointment and proceedings of the Royal Commission which has been inquiring so long and so patiently into the alleged grievances of officers in connexion with the abolition of purchase. Every officer has been allowed to have his say, and to exercise his utmost ingenuity in devising some mode more or less plausible of showing that he will not get all the money he ought, or would reasonably like, to get; and the War Office has interfered but very slightly, and has allowed the military arguments to produce such impression as they were capable of producing on the minds of the lay arbiters of the pecuniary destinies of the officers.

The occasion which drew forth the Duke of RICHMOND's remarks about Mr. HARDY was a speech in which Lord SANDHURST had spoken strongly against the present system of recruiting, and declared that in his opinion the only remedy was to abandon direct recruiting for the army altogether, and recruit only for the Militia, trusting to the Militia for the necessary supply of men for the Line. As every speaker who followed Lord SANDHURST was unfavourable to his proposal, and as the balance of argument is, we think, strongly against it, there is no practical danger of its being adopted. But the reasons which induced Lord SANDHURST to come to his conclusions

are worth considering, as they are the reasons of a man who has seen much and varied service, who thinks for himself, and says what he means. The question of the supply of men for the army is one, he said, which must cause apprehension, if not alarm, to every man acquainted with the facts. The recruits who are now procured are very raw lads. They are so young, and so unformed, that for two years out of the six for which they agree to serve they are unfit for real work. In old days recruits of this stamp did indeed join the army, but they were swallowed up in the number of old seasoned soldiers. Now they will form one-third of the entire force. Lord SANDHURST acknowledged that, so far as India went, they did no real harm. Recruits are not sent to India under twenty, and although they have then but a short time to serve, they still have as long to serve as it is practically found that men can serve in so exhausting a climate as India. But for the general purposes of the service the men entered much too young, and were released much too soon. It is true that the men released are supposed to form part of the Army Reserve, but the Army Reserve is at present something of a sham. If the men belonging to it are called out for training, they come or not as they please, and as a rule they do not please to come. As an instance of this, Lord SANDHURST mentioned that last year a body of 450 men were summoned to the Curragh, and out of that number only 50 obeyed the summons. The only way, he urged, to get men better trained, more seasoned, and more zealous was to draw on the Militia for recruits. The Militia finds no difficulty in getting recruits, or in getting recruits of a tolerably good stamp; and if the best and most adventurous of those so obtained would but enlist for the army, the whole problem would be solved. Even now there is some disposition on the part of Militiamen to enlist, but it might be very much stimulated if the right means were taken. What Lord SANDHURST understands by the right means may be expressed shortly by saying that the men must be bribed with sufficient liberality. They should get a bounty on enlisting, and a higher rate of pay. This might be expensive, but at any rate the nation, which is willing to pay for an army, would then get one in reality, and not in name. If any means of supplementing recruiting through the Militia is to be adopted, it is, as Lord SANDHURST said, to be found in imitating in the army the institutions by which lads are trained for the navy; and as the result had been so favourable for the navy, the experiment might be tried for the army too. But this was only a minor detail. The real proposal which Lord SANDHURST invited the Peers and the Government to consider was that the Militia should be used to feed the Line, and that thus the evils attending two systems of recruiting in the same districts might be stopped, and the army supplied with the stamp of men it really needs.

Lord CARDWELL naturally tried to make the very best of the system for which he is responsible, and declared that Lord SANDHURST's statements were overcharged, and that the picture he gave of the state of the army was much blacker than it need be. But the Duke of CAMBRIDGE did not treat Lord SANDHURST's allegations in anything like the same way. He quite admitted that the recruits now obtained were not what could be wished, that they were very young, and that it is a matter for very serious reflection that when the new system is carried out these very raw recruits will form a much larger proportion of the whole force than used to be the case formerly. He also acknowledged that the men of the Army Reserve ought to be trained much more regularly than they are; and all he could say was that as men are now discharged from the army at a comparatively early age, and encouraged to embark in the various employments of civil life, it is very hard to get men to leave their employers to come to be trained, and equally hard to get the masters to employ men who may be required to absent themselves at an inconvenient time. But the Duke of CAMBRIDGE was as much convinced as everybody else who took part in the debate that it will never do to look to the Militia as the sole source of recruits for the army. The men who are willing to serve in the Militia are, as a rule, quite a different class from those who are willing to serve in the Line, to be absent from their homes for years, and encounter the dangers of war and varying climate. There are many men who like a little soldiering, a few weeks of variety in a dull life every year, an opportunity of seeing friends and acquaintances, even the education of discipline and enforced obedience. But

they like this because they can get it near home, and know that it must come to an end within a short and definite time. Nothing again would tend to destroy the efficiency of a Militia regiment more inevitably, or to dishearten its officers, than if the best men were constantly bribed to leave it and seek service in the army. The Militia might thus easily cease to be efficient, and yet after all the supply of men might fall very short of what the army needs. Lord SANDHURST has therefore no prospect of seeing his suggestion adopted; but he nevertheless has done useful work in calling public attention to the weak point in our present system of keeping up the army. What is to be the remedy it is as yet too early to say. The Duke of CAMBRIDGE wisely said that we must go to work very slowly, and not bewilder recruits or those who think of becoming recruits by fresh changes, unless they are shown to be absolutely necessary. One thing, however, is obvious. If we have to make further changes, to strive to get a better class of men, and to offer them greater inducements to join and stay in the army, we must spend more money. Military reform, we are afraid, to be worth anything, means increased military expenditure.

SPAIN.

THE absurd story of a renewal of the HOHENZOLLERN candidature for the throne of Spain was probably suggested to an ingenious French journalist by the appointment of a German Minister to Madrid. It is possible that the nomination may have no importance; but if it implies a recognition of the Spanish Republic, or rather of the Regency of Marshal SERRANO, it is perhaps not unreasonable to infer that Prince BISMARCK is influenced by some political motive. Up to the present time the German Government has, since the beginning of the French war in 1870, carefully abstained from interference in Spanish affairs. A naval officer who took possession of a Spanish ship which had been seized by the Carthagena rebels was promptly disavowed; and the squadron was from that time exclusively employed in protecting the lives and property of German subjects. Since it is quite certain that, notwithstanding the later fiction of a design to substitute Prince FREDERICK CHARLES for Prince LEOPOLD, Prince BISMARCK has no desire to try a second dynastic experiment, it has been conjectured that he may perhaps wish to obtain the aid of the Provisional Government of Spain in his designs against the POPE. Although diplomatic pressure might in some contingencies be used in connexion with the domestic struggle against Rome, it is difficult to understand how the German Government could derive any support from Spain. Marshal SERRANO and his colleagues are not unfriendly to the Church, which is threatened only by the Republican party. No moderate Government which is likely to be established at Madrid will add to its difficulties an unnecessary quarrel with the clergy, and the German CHANCELLOR will certainly not ally himself with the extreme democratic faction. The difficulties of SERRANO's Ministry, though they have been diminished by the recent successes in the North, are numerous and perplexing. The Carlists, though they have been compelled to abandon the siege of Bilbao, are still active in the field; and Marshal CONCHA has not been able to report any fresh victory since the return of SERRANO to Madrid. The pecuniary embarrassment is, as usual, hopeless; and the Government of Madrid has thought it necessary to warn the newspapers against publishing any criticisms on the financial proposals of the Government.

It may be assumed that an insurrection which has taken place in the province of Cadiz has been promoted by the extreme Republicans. No other faction, even if it were equally unscrupulous, has for the present any motive for appealing to force. The supporters of Don ALFONSO, who may perhaps form a majority of the whole population, would prefer that their candidate should have time to attain full age; and they expect to accomplish their purpose by the aid of the chiefs of the army, though the latest rumour to the effect that Marshal SERRANO had determined to summon the Cortes, and to proclaim the Prince under his own regency, is probably apocryphal. The Federal Republicans had no hesitation in profiting by the extreme need of the Government of their own choice to acquire local independence, although they were fully aware that they were creating a diversion in favour of the Carlists. They have a better excuse for rebelling against the present Government.

from which they can expect neither sympathy nor favour; but, on the other hand, insurrection is now more dangerous than in the days of FIGUERAS and CASTELAR. The numbers and discipline of the army have been to a great extent restored, and Marshal SERRANO may confidently rely on the fidelity of his troops. It might almost seem that the anarchists, who were last year accomplices of the Carlists, are now disposed to facilitate the restoration of Monarchy in the person of Don ALFONSO. In Spain, as in France, the reputable Republic is constantly endangered by the unseasonable energy of the faction which takes Republicanism in earnest. As a speech by GAMBETTA, followed by the election of a demagogue for Paris, overthrew M. THIERS, and established Marshal MACMAHON's Government, it is probable that one or two Federalist risings in Spanish towns might accelerate the probable fall of the Republic. When all the enemies of society call themselves Republicans, the respectable and timid part of the community are easily tempted to forget that there may be other Republicans who have no propensity to general plunder or bloodshed. There is fortunately nothing to fear for the tranquillity of Madrid. General PAVIA performed the valuable service of disarming the rabble which had been foolishly provided with weapons on the establishment of the Republic. The patriots who overawed the Cortes, and who compelled SERRANO to fly in disguise from the capital, are as malignant as formerly, but they are for the present powerless. A considerable part of the Northern Army accompanied or followed SERRANO to Madrid, and it is probable that Marshal CONCHA, who has now his headquarters at Vittoria, could despatch further reinforcements if they were required for the defence of order.

If temporary Governments, such as those which have for some time past existed in France and Spain, become common in Europe, it will perhaps be necessary to modify the rules which control diplomatic relations. The English Government, after the abdication of King AMADEO, declined to recognize the Republic, not on the ground of any objection to its political form, but because the new system was uncertain in duration and dubious in character. The Government which was established by the Federal Republicans was soon succeeded by the popular dictatorship of CASTELAR, until the Cortes dismissed the Ministry, to be themselves immediately expelled by a judicious soldier. The Ministry which derived its title to power from the confidence of General PAVIA afterwards assumed constituent authority by converting its chief into a President of the Republic. Marshal SERRANO may for the present fairly deem himself a legitimate ruler, inasmuch as he possesses the confidence of the respectable classes and of the army; but no English Minister has yet been accredited to his Government. Mr. LAYARD, according to the custom in similar cases, continues to reside in Madrid, and to transact business more or less formally with the Ministers. If he were to resign his office, there might be some difficulty in appointing a successor without according formal recognition to an indefinite and temporary Government. It has nevertheless happened that on more than one occasion serious discussions have arisen between the English Government and successive Spanish Ministries. The correspondence on the capture and restoration of the *Almanza* and *Vittoria* ended in an amicable settlement. The graver controversy raised by the execution in Cuba of the prisoners taken on board the *Virginianus* has not yet been brought to a conclusion. There could be no doubt that both Señor CASTELAR and his successors strongly disapproved of the conduct of the colonial authorities; nor could they, without compromising the national sovereignty, disclaim responsibility for the acts of their subordinates. The proceedings were in themselves absolutely indefensible in law and in morality, for the English sailors and passengers were free from complicity in the designs of the owners of the vessel; and the capture was effected beyond the limits of Spanish jurisdiction. The correspondence between the English and Spanish Governments is still incomplete. In March, Señor SAGASTA excused himself from giving a definite answer to Mr. LAYARD on the ground that the affair had occurred under a previous Administration, and that he had not yet had an opportunity of examining it with due deliberation. Two months later, Lord DERBY not unreasonably expressed a hope that, after the success which the forces of the Government had achieved in Biscay, an answer to the remonstrances of England would not be much further delayed. The English Government has from the first declined to discuss the legality of the capture of the *Virginianus*, which formed

the principal subject of the dispute between Spain and the United States. Lord GRANVILLE and his successor have confined themselves to the contention that the British subjects on board could in no case have become liable to capital punishment. Even if they had been pirates, a court-martial would not have been the proper tribunal to take cognizance of their crime, and it would be absurd to suggest that they were rebels against a Government with which they had no connexion. In this case the outrage on humanity was more criminal than the violation of international law. The procrastination of the Spanish Government can only be attributed either to an inveterate habit of delay, or to conscious inability to punish delinquents who are supported by the popular feeling of an insubordinate colony. It is possible that Marshal SERRANO and his Ministers may be waiting to ascertain whether General CONCHA, now Captain-General of Cuba, is able to assert his authority over the mutinous Volunteers. The civil war or insurrection seems to have lately become less formidable, and it is not known that any other rebel leader has succeeded to the position and influence of CESPEDES. It is an embarrassing but indispensable duty to impress on the Spanish Government the necessity of satisfying just demands which have been preferred in the most friendly spirit. At the beginning of the dispute with the United States, Señor CASTELAR proposed that the whole matter should be referred to the arbitration of England. Lord GRANVILLE properly replied that the question was not such as could be decided by arbitration; and that, in any case, England as an offended party was disqualified for the part of arbitrator.

THE ARCHBISHOPS IN COMMITTEE.

THE surprises which the ARCHBISHOPS have in store for their bewildered flocks will never cease. Their Bill has taken up exactly three debating nights in the House of Lords, and it has already gone through three transformations in its essential features. On Thursday, under the bland chaperonage of Lord CAIRNS, the Archbishop of CANTERBURY and Lord SHAFESBURY were made partners, and the Ecclesiastical Judge for all England, whom the latter has so long and hitherto so fruitlessly been recommending for Parliamentary acceptance, stepped bodily into the Bill. We cannot, however, say that the present arrangement was effected without some little hitches, which may as the measure advances show that to steal a march is never the highest, and often proves not to be the most successful, statesmanship. The ARCHBISHOPS rushed into legislation in complete ignorance of the feelings of the institution over which they preside; they have discovered that they do not carry the Church with them, and their object has become to hurry on their measure before they shall be compelled to own their error. The Archbishop of York for a few moments almost acted the part of candid friend towards his metamorphosed bantling. In its former shapes (he forgot to say how many they were) it had been a gentle, fatherly proposal for winning back stray sheep by sweet monitions and loving deprivations; it was now a fragmentary and incomplete measure of Church discipline, and he really almost felt tempted to vote against it. As for the idea of paying the new Judge out of the funds of the Ecclesiastical Commission, the ARCHBISHOP's heart bled for the poor incumbents who would be thereby mulcted. Paid the Judge must be, but the payment must come from the nation, of which, as he forgot to say, those very incumbents are taxpayers.

But the most touching manifestation of feeling came from the Archbishop of CANTERBURY. Lord SALISBURY had thrown out a hint that this new Judge might be appointed by the Crown, and not, as proposed by Lord SHAFESBURY, by the two Primates. Thereupon the ARCHBISHOP not only professed his steadfast adherence as a Churchman to old principles, but he became very tenderly solicitous for the consciences of the many clergymen of the land who might be scrupulous in taking their law from a Judge who did not owe his authority to an ecclesiastical source. Lord BATH rather aptly pointed out that similar feelings at some earlier stage of the Bill might have been more to the point.

There can be little doubt that a Provincial Judge after the model of the one described by Lord SHAFESBURY would be an important element in a complete reform of an ecclesiastical Judicatory. But the patched and re-

patched Bill of the ARCHBISHOPS is no such reform, and the accident of a good idea having been struck out in the course of debate gives another reason for a wise delay, by showing that principles which might underlie the change are not so difficult to find. In the meanwhile the ARCHBISHOPS are not yet out of the wood of the Committee. When it meets again it will have to decide whether the Bishop shall still have power to refuse entertaining frivolous suits. Lord SHAFESBURY, in his profound distrust of all episcopacy, abstract and concrete, says No; but here we must quite part company with him. The discretion may or may not be indiscreetly or capriciously used; but it will be powerless for anything but to check litigation, and so *prima facie* can hardly fail to be beneficial. On the other hand, the question of the monition holding good *pendente lite* is yet unsettled, and as even according to Lord SHAFESBURY's edition of the Bill the grievance may arise after a decision of the Provincial Judge, which will be formally published as the Bishop's Judgment, we hope that it will not slip through.

LORD SELBORNE was slow to recognize that his project of governing the Church by spontaneous monitions from the Bishop's Palace had been demolished by Lord CAIRNS, but we do not suppose that he will find many peers to agree with him. There will, however, be more discussion over a clause proposed by the Bishop of PETERBOROUGH, to which the CHANCELLOR has unaccountably given his patronage. The Bishop seems to have been struck by the feeling which is growing up in every direction for a revision of the rubrics, and a measure of toleration for various schools of worship; and he proposes accordingly to discount it by singling out one practice—standing before the table at the Communion office—to which High Churchmen attach importance, and four or five others which are dear to the Low and the Broad parties, and, as Lord CAIRNS puts it, "neutralizing" them as to penal consequences. We are astonished that two men of such intellectual power as the CHANCELLOR and the Bishop of PETERBOROUGH could imagine that the powerful feelings which are necessarily generated where religious bodies in any considerable numbers discover a common need could be allayed by so restricted a compromise. Besides, the practical working of the clause would be far from favourable to the very parties for whose benefit it is supposed to have been devised. The inclusion of a few exemptions would reasonably be taken to mean the exclusion of all other practices, and the Church Association would in all probability indemnify itself for the security which the High Churchmen enjoyed as to the position during the Communion service by attacking customs and decorations which have become generally acceptable with the national growth of artistic perceptions. After the Exeter decision nothing is now really safe which may possibly offend any BABEONES. Besides, as the law now stands, the *ultima ratio* of threatened reprisals is a very wholesome rod in pickle; but the Bishop has so worded his exemptions as to relieve that which in a happier moment he himself dubbed the "Persecution Company, Limited," from even this fear. Lord CAIRNS did not leave the subject without introducing a further element of confusion by voluntarily offering to throw the Athanasian Creed into the clause, and so stirring up again into fierce flame a controversy which had so recently and with so much difficulty been appeased. He justified his line by absolutely scouting the idea that there could be any revision of its own rubrics and canons by the Church of England. "The idea that in our days it will be possible to arrive at any alternative for a settlement (*sic*) of the rubrics appears to me to be out of the range of probability." To say this seems to us to be tantamount to saying that the Church of England is a dead Church. But, as we believe it to be a living Church, we must entirely disagree with the LORD CHANCELLOR. Even the Archbishop of CANTERBURY was explicit in saying that, if the Crown gave its power to Convocation to undertake the task, he would himself heartily co-operate. Why not at least try? The experiment will only cost the time of the active agents, and we cannot believe that it will be grudged.

M. LEDRU ROLLIN AND UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.

THE oratorical failure of M. LEDRU ROLLIN is on the whole an advantage for the Republican party in France. There were two kinds of success which it seemed

possible that he might achieve. He might have spoken with all his old fire and eloquence, and employed his undiminished powers to reproduce the Socialist exaggerations with which his name has been especially associated. Or he might have spoken feebly, and yet shown that age had given him sense and calmness, if it had deprived him of energy. In the former case, the damage done to the Republican cause would have been very great. Its one hope of victory lies in its maintaining that character for moderation which during the existence of the present Assembly it has on the whole borne. In the latter case there would have been an excuse for regarding M. LEDRU ROLLIN as the leader of the Left rather than M. GAMBETTA, and M. GAMBETTA is sufficiently suspected by the extreme wing of his followers to render this a far from improbable event. The fanatical Republicans have so far profited by experience that they are not likely to reject his guidance so long as to do so would be to inflict an obvious injury on the prospects of their party. But if they could have argued that M. LEDRU ROLLIN is as prudent as M. GAMBETTA and at the same time a more genuine Radical, they might have ventured into open revolt. The speech actually made by M. LEDRU ROLLIN disposes of both these hypotheses. It was very violent, but it was very weak. It showed no appreciation of the actual state of the question upon which it was delivered. There is a great deal to be said against the proposal to limit universal suffrage, but exceedingly little of it was said by M. LEDRU ROLLIN. In addressing a sovereign Assembly it is of no avail to deny its right to limit the franchise under which it has been elected. Universal suffrage cannot be more sacred than other primary constitutional facts, and if the Assembly is technically competent to decide between Monarchy and the Republic, it must be competent to pass an electoral law. Indeed, on M. LEDRU ROLLIN's theory, there never can be a new electoral law after universal suffrage has once been established, because the general commission to pass laws for the good of the country under which every Legislative Assembly acts cannot authorize any limitation of the body by which the commission was originally given. We may even go further and say that on this principle no Reform Bill can ever be valid. If representatives elected under universal suffrage must not be parties to depriving those whom they represent of electoral power, the same rule will apply to representatives elected under a limited suffrage. But to double the numbers of a constituency is to deprive the old voters of electoral power quite as effectually as to reduce a constituency by half. Therefore, the existing franchise must never be modified, except on the improbable supposition that the holders of it directly instruct their representatives to alter it in this or that particular sense.

There was truth in what M. LEDRU ROLLIN said about the danger of re-establishing select and excluded classes of citizens, but it was too much mixed up with commonplace generalities to make any impression upon the Assembly. The deputies on whom this sort of reasoning might have some useful effect are the moderates of the Right Centre, but the doctrinaire Republicanism of M. LEDRU ROLLIN is so distasteful to them that the argument loses all its force when it comes from his lips. No man of any skill in Parliamentary strategy would have told the Orleanists, who, even in defeat, hold the balance between the two sides of the Chamber, that when the Monarchy of King LOUIS PHILIPPE fell, "all France" declared that the Government of Contempt had fallen "under the blows of the Revolution of Contempt." The Orleanists have every right to reproach the Republicans with being the authors of much of the mischief that followed upon the Revolution of 1848. If they had only waited, they could in the end have forced LOUIS PHILIPPE's Government to concede all the essentials of liberty, and France might have enjoyed under a Constitutional Monarchy that tranquil freedom which she is now striving against so much opposition to enjoy under a Constitutional Republic. The mistake of which the Orleanists have lately been guilty is that they do not see that the adjective in these two phrases is of more importance than the substantive, and that Constitutional Monarchy and the Constitutional Republic are really different forms of the same thing. In 1873 the Constitutional Republic was in possession of the field, and the true policy of the Orleanists was to help in organizing and consolidating it. But in 1848 the duty of the Republicans was equally plain. Constitutional Monarchy was in possession of the field, and their true policy was to make the best of it. It may be too much to expect

them to admit this openly; for Republicans, especially French Republicans, have to bear a burden of infallibility which, by preventing them from confessing a blunder, prevents their adversaries from forgetting that they have made one. But it was not necessary to reopen the subject. There is no immediate connexion between 1848 and 1874, and men who return to political life after an absence from it of at least a quarter of a century ought at least to let bygones be bygones.

The *Times'* Correspondent gives the substance of a speech delivered in the train by a hitherto silent deputy, for whom he predicts great success whenever he makes his appearance in the tribune. This gentleman considers that the prediction that revolt will follow upon the suppression of universal suffrage is a mere invention of Republicans and Imperialists, and that the best thing the Royalists can do is to prove by suppressing it that the nation cares nothing about universal suffrage. "The country desires no better than to be freed 'from that responsible burden the universal vote.'" Certainly if any one has foretold that an insurrection will immediately follow upon the suppression of universal suffrage, there is every chance that he will be proved a false prophet. But this is not the form which the prediction has usually taken. There is very little doubt that so long as Marshal MACMAHON remains at the head of the Government and can count upon the support of the army the Assembly may limit the suffrage as it chooses without running any risk. But in the end there will come a time when the country, grown weary of a provisional order of things, or alarmed at the approaching restoration of a Legitimist and reactionary Monarchy, will once more be attracted by the vision of an orderly and prosperous democracy which will be held out to it by the partisans of the Empire. We, the Bonapartists say, can offer you everything that the Royalists offer, with universal suffrage into the bargain. Under no Government was France ever more tranquil than under the Government of NAPOLEON III., and the secret of his success was that he showed no distrust of the French nation. There was a minority opposed to him, but its strength was accurately known, because, instead of constituting an unknown quantity, as under a restricted suffrage it must do, it was free to express itself at the poll, and could be told vote by vote. Under a Royalist Monarchy peaceful citizens will be continually anticipating insurrection. Under a Republic they will be continually in fear of licensed disorder. The Empire supplies a guarantee against the first in the breadth of its popular basis, and against the second in the traditional vigour of its administration. It can afford to be resolute, because it knows that it is popular. There is just that amount of truth in this way of putting the case which is needed to make the presentation plausible. The Bonapartists are obliged for consistency's sake to vote against the electoral law, but in their hearts they must be its warm friends. The nameless deputy quoted by the *Times'* Correspondent objects to universal suffrage because it is the embodiment of the "everlasting strife between him who has and him who has not." But he who has not is not banished from the country when he is banished from the political system of the country. He remains within call, and it is to him that the invitation of the Imperialists will come with so much force. If there were no organized and unscrupulous party to bid for his support, the whole question of electoral reform might be argued from a different starting point, and worked out to a different conclusion. But the presence of such a party is a fact which cannot be ignored in speculating upon French politics. Whatever happens, the Bonapartists will be on the watch, standing ready to profit by every slip of their opponents, and to make use of every instrument which they may reject. To give them the restoration of universal suffrage by way of a bait to attract popular favour would be to put into their hands a weapon which, four-and-twenty years ago, they used with wonderful success, and which, for anything that appears to the contrary, may still be found to possess its old potency.

THE PROTECTION OF BRITISH SUBJECTS.

THE duty of protecting English subjects in all parts of the world, and especially in imperfectly civilized countries, is at the same time imperative and troublesome. Barbarians, such as the Abyssinians or Ashantees,

only provoke retribution on special occasions. In ordinary circumstances a traveller in Africa pursues his adventure at his own risk, and even remote Asiatic potentates have sometimes murdered Englishmen with impunity. Regular European Governments for the most part deal with foreigners on recognized principles, although it becomes from time to time necessary to remonstrate with Spain for unjustifiable severity inflicted on the crews of vessels suspected of smuggling. The half-civilized Republics of South America profess to observe the rules of international law; but the ignorance or violence of their official agents has a constant tendency to provoke collisions. The outrage inflicted on an English Vice-Consul in Guatemala seems to have been the act of a drunken ruffian, whom his superiors will not attempt to protect from the consequences of his conduct, though they are themselves primarily responsible for the opportunity which he derived from his official rank of perpetrating a monstrous outrage. The Government of Guatemala will probably be allowed to settle the matter by due compensation and by the punishment of the delinquent. At the same time, the comparatively respectable Government of Chili has blundered into a violation of the simplest rules of international law. The master of an English vessel partly manned by a Chilian crew had incurred shipwreck, attended with loss of life, by, as it was alleged, overloading and unskillful seamanship. After an inquiry into the case, which resulted in an unfavourable judgment, Captain HYDE sailed for England with a passport which authorized his departure, but on the arrival of the packet at another Chilian port, he was arrested and taken to prison on the charge of having caused the death of some of the seamen who had been lost. It is still uncertain whether he has been released, and whether the Chilian Government has tendered due apology and compensation. The English Minister to whom the matter had been properly referred by the Consul had shown due energy in protesting against the irregularity, and it may be hoped that demands which are demonstrably just will not fail to be conceded. Some Chilian newspapers have taken the opportunity to bluster about the dignity of an independent Republic, and the failure of the Spanish Government under O'DONNELL to make any impression on the defences of Chili and Peru. It may be presumed that the Chilian Government will be more reasonable when it is satisfied that the action of the subordinate authorities is wholly indefensible.

The doctrine that a merchant ship on the high seas is exclusively subject to its national jurisdiction has been again and again affirmed by competent tribunals, and by the general assent of Governments. Even if Captain HYDE, instead of being merely charged with negligence or incompetence, had committed at sea any crime short of piracy, he would not have been liable to question in any foreign court. Only two or three months ago the Spanish Government surrendered the *Deerhound*, which had been captured on the open sea with a cargo of military stores intended for the use of the Carlist insurgents. If the Carlists had been acknowledged as belligerents, and if a blockade of the Northern ports had been established, the seizure would have been lawful; and there is a certain anomaly in the immunity enjoyed by neutral vessels which are really acting as auxiliaries in a civil war. In a choice of evils it has been thought desirable to limit as closely as possible the right of interference with foreign vessels; and it is evident that England, as the greatest maritime Power, would be interested in the extension rather than in the restriction of rights of search and seizure. The Spanish Government conceded with little hesitation the exclusive jurisdiction of the Government to which a vessel on the open sea belongs. The claim of the Republic of Chili to punish an English master of a vessel for alleged misconduct at sea is far less plausible than the capture of the *Deerhound*. The Liverpool Police Courts have repeatedly declined to take cognizance of complaints against American captains preferred by seamen. A failure of justice frequently occurs when offences have been committed at sea; but it is presumed that the national tribunals will in all cases be competent to discharge their duties.

The propensity of subordinate functionaries, and even of petty Governments, in outlying regions to infringe the privileges of English subjects may sometimes be attributed to personal or local jealousies, and not unfrequently to a false notion of dignity. It is said that the Company by which Captain HYDE had been employed is disliked by

native shipowners, probably because its operations are skilful, successful, and profitable not only to the capitalists concerned, but to the country in which they conduct their operations. It must be pleasant to fasten on such a misfortune as the loss of an English vessel through mismanagement, and to exhibit the salutary rigour of the native judicial procedure; but the Chilian Court might as well inquire into the causes of a railway accident in England as into the supposed misconduct of an English master of a vessel on the high seas. If, indeed, the ship had been sunk in Chilian waters, the local jurisdiction might possibly have attached. The allegation that the ship was improperly loaded in a Chilian port is too remote. No indictment has ever been preferred in an English Court against a foreign captain on the ground that his conduct in English waters may have contributed to the subsequent loss of his ship outside the jurisdiction. The circumstances of Captain HYDE's case raise a presumption of official or judicial irregularity. The arrest which was arranged after a passport had been issued was probably procured through some indirect influence; or perhaps it may have been extorted by popular clamour. The plausible proposition that natives ought to be equal with foreigners before the law may have been hastily affirmed without regard to the condition that foreigners must in the first instance be within the jurisdiction. It is not perhaps at first sight obvious to the general understanding that a ship is a floating part of the country to which she belongs. The fiction is suspended while a merchant vessel lies in a foreign port, to revive as soon as she recommences her voyage and gains an offing. The accidental presence of Chilian sailors on board the shipwrecked English vessel may perhaps have been supposed to affect the question of the criminal liability of the captain; but foreign sailors on board an English vessel are subject to English law, although they may possibly beat the same time within the jurisdiction of their own courts.

In the absence of special and local knowledge, it is impossible to appreciate the motives which may from time to time induce petty States to provoke little conflicts with foreign Powers. A President or a Minister in need of a revival of popularity cannot do better than in displaying his patriotism and his indifference to consequences, which can indeed always be averted by timely concession. It is well known in Chili as in other parts of the world that England greatly dislikes even the smallest quarrel if it can reasonably be avoided. It is not exactly, as warlike journalists hint, from fear of Chili, but from unwillingness to resort to force, that the English Government will greatly prefer to obtain satisfaction by diplomatic methods. In the meantime the champions of the dignity of the Republic will be rewarded with the applause of their partisans, and the ultimate apology and the damages paid to the injured party will perhaps excite little attention. If the Governments of South American Republics attended exclusively to the interests of the communities which they represent, they would perhaps hesitate, not so much to offend foreign Powers, as to disturb the confidence of merchants and money-lenders. The prosperity of the Spanish Republics depends largely on the resident English traders, and on the firms at home with which they are connected. There is also from time to time a loan to be negotiated on terms which are more or less easy in proportion to the character of each State for tranquillity and justice. The compensation which will be paid to Mr. MAGEE for the Guatemala outrage will probably come out of the pockets of the bondholders in the first instance, but it will hereafter increase the rate of interest on future loans. Prudent capitalists will not lend money, except at usurious rates, to States which persistently misunderstand the rules of international law. Collisions would be much more frequent if every dispute were referred to arbitration instead of being settled directly or indirectly by an appeal to force. The experience of Geneva has fortunately discredited the contrivance which had formerly been so much favoured by philanthropists. It will not be left to a Swiss arbitrator to rule that English Vice-Consuls ought to be flogged, or even that English captains ought to be tried by foreign courts for acts done on the high seas.

THE LICENSING BILL.

THE hours for closing both public-houses and beer-houses are likely to be fixed at 12.30 in the metropolis, 11 in towns generally, and 10 in the country. A

division has been taken on Mr. FORSYTH's amendment, which would have made the hour 12 in the metropolis, and the amendment was rejected. We should feel no hesitation in deciding against Mr. FORSYTH's argument that "people could obtain within the theatres all the refreshment they required." Already it may be suspected that some theatres are kept open mainly with a view to the sale of refreshments within their walls; and it is clearly not desirable to encourage a style of entertainment which degrades the drama into a mere stimulant to tippling. Again, Mr. FORSYTH proposed that the later hour should be allowed only within a limited area around Drury Lane, but this would not meet the demand which Mr. LOCKE preferred on behalf of the patrons of the transpontine theatres. Mr. CROSS stated that since the Act of 1872 the number of "occasional licences" had largely increased, and we may be tolerably sure that it is inexpedient to maintain a law so stringent as to require perpetual exemptions. Mr. CROSS further stated that "there was a good deal of illicit drinking going on in London," and upon this point it may be supposed that the HOME SECRETARY is well informed, particularly when his statement agrees with antecedent probability. But, after all, Parliament must place some confidence in Government, and when the HOME SECRETARY declares that, being responsible for the peace of London, he could not recommend closing public-houses at 12 o'clock, there ought to be no further question about the matter. As regards uniformity of the closing hour for beer-houses and public-houses, that was chiefly a question for the police, and if they see their way to grant it, nobody else is concerned to object. Sir W. V. HARcourt, who affirmed in a former debate that Licensed Victuallers did not supply victuals, has, with a laudable desire for accurate information, employed persons to make inquiries, and he finds that "beds, chops, and steaks" are not to be procured at gin-palaces. If he had instructed his emissaries to seek "beds" at beer-houses the quest might perhaps have been successful. In truth, however, the business of victualling is carried on by both classes of houses, and Mr. MELLY stated that in a district well known to him some of the beer-houses are clubs of working-men which certainly deserve as much liberty as is allowed to public-houses.

As regards the hour of opening, it will be 5 o'clock in the metropolis, and 6 o'clock in towns generally and in the country. There is much to be said in favour of Mr. SANDFORD's proposal to make the hour 5 o'clock everywhere, and Mr. CROSS seems to admit that a later hour can only be maintained with the mitigation of special licences at harvest-time and similar occasions, which we think objectionable. In connexion with this point we may mention the system of "allotments," which was formerly a favourite hobby of philanthropists. At this time of the year a man might work at his allotment for an hour or two before going to his regular employment, and if he desired to do this, he would find a pint of beer agreeable, and perhaps necessary, at 5 o'clock or earlier. Employers of labour will probably object to allotments and to early beer, but legislation cannot be conducted wholly from their point of view. Upon this question, however, it is desirable to look at facts, and therefore we will quote one or two cases which were actually submitted to magistrates at Brighton, and in which an extension of hours was asked for and refused. The keeper of a beer and coffee-house stated that he had had an average of one hundred customers between 5 and 6 o'clock, and that he always had hot coffee ready for them. Another man in the same business stated that from fifty to sixty working-men sometimes came to him between 5 and 6 o'clock; some would take coffee, some tea, and some beer, and he always kept coffee, tea, and eatables ready. The holder of a wine and spirit licence wished to open, as he had been used to do, at 4 o'clock for the convenience of the market people, whose principal refreshment was tea and coffee. To these and other applications the same answer was returned, that the uniform hour of opening must in future be 6 o'clock. We mention these cases because the details of them happen to be before us, and they are probably fair samples of a large class which deserve to be carefully considered. It cannot be right to sever the tea and coffee business from the beer and spirit houses, and it would be extravagant to propose that this business should be destroyed, particularly when we consider that wholesome drinking water is lamentably scarce. We would submit

that these cases show that paternal, or rather maternal, government has been carried far enough.

Much has been said about the use by the HOME SECRETARY of "confidential information," but we can easily understand that everybody has not the courage of the "borough authority" of Bradford, who openly states that grocers' shops "afford facilities for secret drinking by females, who have been known to obtain drink and have it charged for as groceries in their account." We should think that between grocers and "females" the "borough authority" who is known to have made this statement would have a bad time of it. Again, the "borough authority" of Bridgenorth states that spirit-drinking has increased, especially among the women, and this is possibly owing to the grocers. In the city of Chester there has been "some little increase of quiet drinking." The Mayor of Coventry is of opinion that females purchasing spirits should "not have less than a full bottle," and he evidently makes this suggestion in the interests of sobriety. He is under the impression (but in this he must be mistaken) that grocers retail as little as half a pint, "which appears to be an evil to the housewife when pursuing her grocery for the week's consumption." The "borough authority" of Deal has the audacity to assert that "women have been known to obtain spirits at the grocer's and have it placed in account as grocery to deceive their husbands." Of course this sort of fraud could be perpetrated more easily with half a pint than a quart. Another "borough authority" thinks that "grocers should attend to their own trade." The Mayor of Dunstable thinks that many women would buy spirits at a grocer's who would not be seen entering a public-house. We are glad to hear that in Exeter the lower classes generally prefer beer to spirits. The "borough authority" of Gateshead thinks that "females are much tempted" by spirit grocers generally, but in that borough only two shops of that class exist. From Halifax we are informed that spirit-drinking has increased; but the class of persons using grocers' shops would not be likely to frequent public-houses. From Kendal it is reported that drinking amongst women has increased. From Liverpool a statement comes which for the size of the place is important. There has been a large increase in spirit-drinking, and this is partly due to the sale in grocers' shops and to the shortened hours on Sunday. There has been an increase since 1872 of fifty-five spirit-grocers, and the total number is now seventy-nine. We cannot help thinking that this statement justifies the apprehension that restriction may not always mean reform. People provide themselves against Sunday and the early closing of houses of entertainment by a private bottle. From Newcastle-upon-Tyne an equally unsatisfactory statement is transmitted:— "Many persons are found in a state of intoxication, having in their possession small dram-bottles sold by innkeepers." This case must not be credited to the grocers, but the same remark applies to all these cases. They do not prove that restriction of hours does harm, but they suggest that it may do less good than has been expected.

We necessarily write in ignorance as to how the Committee will deal with those amendments which apply to grocers. But we do not hesitate to express the hope that Parliament will not carry the restrictive policy to an absurd and impracticable extreme. The "borough authorities" have been invited to express their opinions whether grocers ought to be placed "on the same conditions as to magisterial approval as other licensed houses." We should say that substantially this has been done already by the Act of 1872, which requires grocers selling spirits to obtain from the licensing justices "a licence authorizing such sale." It is true that the same Act provides that such licence shall not be refused except on certain specified grounds having reference to the character or conduct of the applicant. But it is hardly credible that the Home Office could seriously contemplate carrying the matter further than this. A licence may be refused to a house selling liquor "to be drunk on the premises," because the magistrates may think that such house is not required. This practice, however open to theoretical objection, has become established. But it would be a startling novelty to propose to apply the same rule to shops selling liquor for home consumption; and if it were applied to grocers, it might with equal reason be applied to those who sell wine and spirits as their sole business. It would come in fact to this, that the magistrates of Liverpool must decide whether seventy-nine persons should divide among

themselves a valuable trade, or whether competitors should be introduced into it.

On the whole, we do not think that the restriction of hours, provided it be not carried to an inconvenient extent, will do much good or any harm. We are glad to observe that the publicans and beer-house keepers perceive that shorter hours would be for their own advantage. We think that any restriction which is admitted to require numerous exceptions to make it work had better be abandoned. We do not expect that any possible restrictions will restrain the bottle trade in spirits, and we should not be greatly surprised if a few years' experience produces a reaction against restrictions generally. We do not suppose that the publicans will be greatly affected by Sir W. V. HARROUD's demonstration that the present Government are, after all, not so very much their friends. They will look not only to what is done, but to the way of doing it, and they will observe with satisfaction that Mr. Cross has a prudent reluctance to enunciate broad principles.

RATEPAYERS AND COMMUNICANTS.

THE Duke of ARGYLL's speech on the Scotch Church Patronage Bill is remarkable both in itself and for the criticisms which it has suggested. It shows among other things how little the late Government understood that public opinion on ecclesiastical matters of which they were in a great measure the creators. It is true that Mr. GLADSTONE and his colleagues "never hesitated to express their opinion that the measure for the disestablishment of the Irish Church was founded on the special conditions of Ireland, and afforded no precedent for a similar measure in respect of England or of Scotland." But it is evident that some at all events of the Ministers did not feel sure how this opinion would be regarded by their followers. "The atmosphere of the 'late Parliament,' says the Duke of ARGYLL, 'was unfavourable to Established Churches.' It would be nearer the truth to say that it was supposed to be unfavourable to Established Churches. The Dissenting wing of the Liberal party had formed an exaggerated estimate of their own strength, and they succeeded for some time in imposing that estimate on the Government. The Duke of ARGYLL's advice to the leaders of the Scotch Church is evidence of this. When he bade them "avoid coming to Parliament," he probably had in his mind the inconvenience which he thought would result to the Liberal party, as well as the inconvenience which he thought might result to the Church. He must have made the same speech in substance as he made on Tuesday, and by that means influential supporters would have been alienated, and the threatened schism between Liberals and Dissenters precipitated. When reasoning in this way the Duke of ARGYLL overlooked the impossibility of averting that schism in the long run, and the consequent unwise of alienating those who might have been retained in the effort to retain those who were certain to be lost. If he had said in 1872 what he says in 1874, a good many Liberal members might have been offended, but a more than corresponding number of Liberal electors might have been conciliated. We were always among those who maintained that the impression that the late Government was prepared to yield anything to the Nonconformists, provided that the screw was turned tight enough, was altogether ill founded; but there can be no doubt that the impression was largely entertained, and that it had a most disastrous effect on the fortunes of the Liberal party at the general election. If it had been generally believed that in the opinion of the Government there was "nothing connected with Liberal politics in a general policy of disestablishment," one great cause of distrust would have been removed. It may be true that in the late Parliament "all questions relating to the connexion between Church and State were in a 'state of chaos'; but the chaos was in part attributable to the unwillingness of the Government to offend the Dissenters by speaking its mind. The *Daily News* considers that the Duke of ARGYLL's speech "marked the point at which the Liberal party of the future will be found to take 'farewell of the Liberal party of the past'; and describes the latter as merely holding to 'Liberalism in politics,' while the former hold in addition to 'Liberalism in the relations between Church and State.' This is one of the many signs which show that the Nonconformists have entirely missed the lesson of the Liberal disaster. If the Liberal party of the future is to take farewell of the Liberal party of the past in the sense of making the doc-

trine of Disestablishment an indispensable note of true Liberalism, it may take a long farewell of power at the same time. If the late Government had understood this more clearly, the political history of the next ten years might have been different from what it is likely to be.

The particular point which has moved the *Daily News* to part company from the Duke of ARGYLL is his desire to see the right of patronage in the Scotch Church given to communicants rather than to ratepayers. "Herein he sure" rendered the whole principle upon which the State "Church of the modern political world rests its claims, and "fell back upon the State Church of Ecclesiasticism and "of mediæval pretence." Large historical generalizations are edged tools in political discussion, and the writer of this last sentence has hardly appreciated the distinction between modern and mediæval Churches. The Duke of ARGYLL maintains that in modern societies "a bishop or a minister is not "the bishop or minister of every man in a diocese or parish, "but only of those who choose to come to him and who "require his ministrations." It might have been thought that in a country where there are more sects than dioceses, and where every man is free to use the ministrations of a bishop or to leave them alone, this came almost too near a truism. The *Daily News*, however, has fully justified the Duke of ARGYLL's repetition of it. So far is it from being a truism, that it appears to an important English newspaper a mediæval pretence, a theory worthy of "the Roman Church of HILDEBRAND." It is well for the writer that he did not live in HILDEBRAND's time, and feel moved to tell him that he was the bishop only of those who chose to come to him and who required his ministrations. Probably the ministrations most required in that case would have been the last sacraments. The mediæval view of a State Church was exactly the view which the *Daily News* supposes to be modern—a Church "which never is closed, never can be closed, "against anybody." No doubt at that time another idea was included in the definition, and the State Church was also a Church outside of which no one was allowed to remain. But this did but exclude still more completely the notion that it was a matter of choice whether a man should avail himself of a bishop's ministrations. Nor is it only upon the State Church of mediæval times that the *Daily News* is in confusion. It is equally so as to the State Church of modern times in countries other than England. Among us it is possible by a sort of legal fiction to say that the Established Church is "a public institution "the benefits of which and the concerns of which are to "be freely open to all classes of the people." But it is not possible to say this in France or Germany. In France the religions recognized by the State are all in their several ways State Churches, but, except in the sense that they are all glad enough to receive converts, they are not open to all classes of the people. In Germany the concerns of the Evangelical Church are not open to the Roman Catholics, and the present contest between Prince BISMARCK and the Ultramontanes would hardly have been possible if the Roman Catholic Church had not in a sense been established. The only rational idea of a State Church in modern times is that the majority of the nation, finding it convenient to appropriate certain parts of the national property to religious uses, make this appropriation to one or more particular religious bodies. In this country the majority prefer to give all to one. In France and Germany they prefer to give part to one and part to another. The notion of these Churches controlling or being controlled by the whole population of the country is really a survival from the time when citizenship and churchmanship were identical. If it has lingered longer in England than elsewhere, that is merely another instance of the antiquarianism which is so marked a characteristic of English legal ideas.

As regards the particular question which has raised this controversy, the substitution of ratepayers for communicants, besides nullifying the whole scope and purpose of the Bill, would be an act of positive tyranny. So long as citizenship means churchmanship, there is no injustice in giving all citizens the rights, whatever they may be, which the Church allows to her lay members. But when citizenship no longer implies churchmanship, when, as is said to be the case in some parts of Scotland, the majority of the inhabitants belong to hostile communions, this attribution of an ecclesiastical virtue to the payment of rates becomes worse than unmeaning. Why should Roman Catholics or Episcopalians or United Presbyterians have a voice in the presentation to

livings in the Scotch Established Church? If their choice is to be restricted to clergymen of that Church, the privilege is one which they are not fitted to exercise, for they probably know nothing of the candidates; and as they will not avail themselves of their ministrations, it is also one which they cannot care to exercise, except as a means of spiting their neighbours of the Established Church. If, on the contrary, they are not to be thus limited, but may present clergymen of their own religion, this is nothing less than the substitution of a local for a national establishment. Roman Catholicism might become the State religion in one Scotch parish, the Free Kirk in another, and the Scotch Episcopal Church in a third. This might be a change for the better in the Scotch ecclesiastical system, but it would be a strangely complete revolution to be introduced by a mere amendment into a Bill of which the object is to strengthen the Establishment in its present shape.

ROYAL DUKES.

A NOTHER son of the Queen has received a seat in the House of Lords, and there has naturally been the usual kind of talk in the papers. And not the least notable thing in the matter is the piece of advice given by the *Times* to the Duke of Connaught that, though he has become a Duke, yet he is not to do what another Duke may do; that, though the law gives him certain powers, he must take care not to make use of them; that, though he becomes a member of the Legislature with a right to speak and vote in one House of Parliament, yet he must not think of voting there, while other members of the same body freely may. We are not going to discuss the practical wisdom of the advice; that is quite another matter. We are going only to meditate a little on the singular state of things which it really is when a man who has just been clothed with new rights and new powers can, to say the least, without manifest absurdity, be at once cautioned to abstain from all use of the rights and powers with which he has just been clothed.

This state of things, like many other things in this country, has come of itself; it is not the result of any formal enactment; for it would be hard to conceive a law forbidding a man to exercise his legal rights without taking those legal rights from him. It is one of the cases in which a conventional understanding almost as strong as law has gradually grown up. The Duke of Connaught a few days back was a commoner eligible to a seat in the House of Commons; now he is a peer with a seat in the House of Lords. But it would certainly be thought strange, most likely it would be called "unconstitutional," if he were to take to the career which is open to other members of the Houses of Lords and Commons. It would not be thought the thing for a son of the Sovereign to take, as any other member may if he can, a leading part in the debates of the House, to hold a place in the body which practically administers the government, or to take a part among those whose function—no less constitutionally recognized—it is to look out for the errors of those who administer the government, and to take their place if they can. But no law hinders him from doing these things; if the Duke of Connaught should stand forth, as the Black Prince did, as a Parliamentary leader, a chief of Opposition, the foremost among the champions of reform, he has exactly the same legal right to do all this as the Black Prince had.

The change which makes it impossible for the Duke of Connaught to do with general approval what the Black Prince did—a change which therefore makes it impossible for him to do it at all—comes very naturally from the changes which have taken place since then in the condition of the kingly office itself. But it comes from them combined with certain other influences, of quite another kind and coming from quite another quarter, but which have practically fitted in with those changes in a most remarkable way. The changes which made our sovereigns what is now understood by the words "constitutional monarchs" are all of native growth, and every change has implied some lessening of the real royal power. But side by side with this process, the Continental notion of a royal family, as something altogether distinct from the nation, a notion which had its root in the extremest notions of royal power, came in along with the Hanoverian dynasty; and the two things, so utterly opposite in their origin, starting from principles the most hostile to one another, have been found in practice to work well together. A royal family there has indeed been from the beginning, a family honoured above all others as the noblest among the noble, a family out of which in an earlier stage Kings were chosen, and whose members in a later stage have succeeded to the crown according to rules marked down by law. Two members of this royal family, the eldest son and the eldest daughter of the reigning Sovereign, have actual rights and privileges bestowed by the law. The rest have, like the children of peers, a barren precedence only. The eldest son is a peer by birth; the other members of the family are not peers or anything else, unless the King chooses to do for them what he may equally do for any other of his subjects.

It is plain that this is something very different from the modern popular notion about "royal" personages. The use of the name "royal" at once shows the difference. It shows, for one thing,

how utterly the notion of the kingly office, as an office, is forgotten, how it has been lost in the notion of the hereditary exaltation of a single family. Nothing is more common than for a visit from a subject to be called a "royal" visit, for the marriage of two subjects to be called a "royal" marriage. This means of course that the persons spoken of are sons or daughters or other near kinsfolk of a King or Queen. But that does not make their doings "royal." They are members of a royal family, because they are members of a family which exclusively supplies Kings, but they are not "royal" themselves. No one would call a visit from a Duke's son or daughter a "ducal visit," or the marriage of a Duke's son or daughter a "ducal marriage." But he might quite rightly speak of a "ducal family," that is, a family which supplies Dukes, a family one member of which at a time is always a Duke. Why is there this difference of usage? To call a visit from a person who is not a King or Queen a "royal visit" is of course a vulgarism which ought to be left to the penny-a-liners. But the fact that any people at all talk about a "royal visit," when they would not in the analogous case speak of a "ducal visit," has causes which are worth thinking of. The cause is just this, that, exalted as Dukes may be, they and their children do not form a class which is absolutely cut off from the rest of the world. There are others whose rank comes so near to theirs that they do not stand by themselves as an absolutely distinct class, but at most as a class within a class. They freely intermarry with other people; they need not be spoken to with bated breath; they are not necessarily "attended" by some one wherever they go; they are not said to "honour" people by dining with them; their doings, public and private, are subject to free discussion. In short, they are still ordinary human beings, though they may hold the first place among ordinary human beings. But the "royal" personages are really, in popular belief, something more than ordinary human beings. They are "royal"; that is in fact they are treated as if they were themselves Kings and not subjects. It is forgotten that the difference between the King and the highest of his subjects is really wider than the difference between the highest of his subjects and the lowest. That is to say, the kingly office is forgotten; that which separates the crowned and anointed King from all who are not crowned and anointed is lost in the notion of mere exalted hereditary rank. While the children of a Duke are never mistaken for Dukes, while their doings are never called "ducal," the children of a King are practically mistaken for Kings, and their doings are called "royal."

It must of course not be forgotten that, though reverence for members of the royal family has certainly grown stronger, though the distinction between them and other people has certainly grown wider within the last hundred and fifty years or so, yet it would have been equally a sign of what we mean if it had merely stayed as it was. For all other distinctions have got fainter and fainter. It is now thought an honour to "attend" on—in plain words to be a servant to—a "royal" Duke or Duchess. No one thinks it an honour to "attend" a Duke or Duchess who is not royal. Now we need not say that there was a time when men of any rank thought it an honour to "attend" men of the rank next above their own. When a nobleman had gentlemen and knights in his own service, it was not wonderful that he should himself not disdain the service of a King or even of a King's son. The remarkable thing is that, while the service of rank to rank has died out in all other cases, it has lived on in this. We suspect that the distinction has in some points grown positively stronger; but even if it has not, it has practically grown stronger by remaining the only distinction. While the royal family was once merely the highest stage of many ascending stages, it now stands by itself, parted from all below it in a way in which none of the lower stages are parted from one another. Or perhaps we should say that it is the highest stage but one which has gained, while the highest of all has lost. When we call the doings of the *Ætheling* "royal," we certainly exalt the *Ætheling* at the expense of the King.

We have said that two opposite causes, at least two causes springing from opposite sources, have joined together to bring about this state of things. As the personal authority of the Crown becomes less and less, as royalty becomes more and more of a constitutional abstraction, it follows almost naturally that the homage paid to the sovereign will become, if not greater in degree, at least different in kind. The less real authority the sovereign has, the more does he become a person whose sayings are not to be contradicted, whose acts are not to be criticized. For the conventional system of a constitutional monarchy takes care that the sovereign shall not say anything that can be contradicted or do anything that can be criticized. It does not follow that a constitutional King is a mere puppet. What Ammianus said mockingly of a despot and his favourite may be said more gravely and in a better sense of a King who is not a despot. Constantius was said to have a good deal of influence with the chief of the eunuchs, and, in a better sense, a sensible King may have a good deal of influence with a sensible Minister. But it is the Minister alone who is set up to be contradicted and criticized; the King personally never comes forward, as Kings who really ruled often did, to oppose or dispute with any of his subjects. No modern King is likely to be told by one of his Earls, "By God, Sir King, I will neither go nor hang." But that is because no modern King is likely to say to one of his Earls, "By God, Sir Earl, you shall either go or hang." The greater the King's personal power, the more sure he is to meet with direct opposition, the more sure his acts are to be fully canvassed and condemned. The more the King retires from the exercise of personal authority and the conflicts which it brings

with it, the more he withdraws into a region beyond censure and criticism. He thus gets surrounded by a halo of reverence which does not spring directly from his office, and which can more easily extend itself to those about him. While the King was a personal power, his sons, if they thought good, took a leading part in public affairs. As a great nobleman started in public life with a great advantage, a King's son started with a greater advantage still. And it was not at all thought to be his duty to forbear to make use of that advantage, any more than it was the duty of the nobleman. As the King has more and more retired from the personal exercise of power, it has more and more come to be held that the business of his sons is to hold aloof from the practical work of public life, and to keep themselves for purposes of show. The process has been gradual. There is a marked difference between the position of the sons of the present Queen and that of the sons of George the Second and George the Third. But the position of the sons of George the Second and George the Third differs yet more widely from the position of the sons of Edward the Third and Henry the Fourth. No prince of the House of Brunswick has been the acknowledged leader either of the Ministry or of the Opposition in either House of Parliament. Both positions—or what answered to them in those days—were held by Kings' sons in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

This is one cause, but, as we have said, it has been strengthened by an opposite cause. The Kings of the House of Brunswick brought over with them a number of notions about the greatness of royal and princely families, and the wide distinction between them and the rest of mankind, which had never before been heard of in England. A change came in these matters when the descendant of the Welfs succeeded the granddaughter of Lord Chancellor Clarendon. The change in nomenclature was an outward sign. Englishmen were taught, but only gradually, to talk of "Princess" Emily and "Princess" Caroline with tongues which had been used to the Lady Mary and the Lady Anne. The thing reached its climax, not so much in the so-called "Royal Marriage Act" itself, as in the feelings which led to it, and in the popular interpretation put upon it. The common, though mistaken, saying—practically refuted by the good sense of our present Queen—that neither the King nor any member of his family can "marry a subject" marks the full separation of the royal family from the rest of the world. The practical lessening of the royal power renders it practically convenient that members of the royal family should abstain from that prominent part in public affairs which was once open to them as to other people. The new Continental notion fostered the notion that there was something, not as our fathers held, in the regal office, but in the mere royal blood, which made its owner something of a different nature from other men. Opposite in their origin, the two doctrines worked well together, and they have gradually led to a state of things in which nobody is surprised that, when the Queen's son is clothed with rights and powers which he had not before, he is at once warned that he must not think of using these rights and powers as other holders of them may.

Another incidental cause has helped in all this. For nearly three centuries "royal" personages were so scarce in England that it was no wonder that, when they began to be more common, people began to look upon them as a distinct class from other people. All through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the royal family consisted of very few members; sometimes, as in the reign of Elizabeth, there could not be said to be any royal family at all. Between Henry the Fourth and George the First six sovereigns only were the fathers of a Prince of Wales, two of them, it may be noted, were the fathers of two Princes of Wales. And in all that time Charles the First, as Prince of Wales, and James the Second, as Duke of York, were the only son or brother of a King who had ever the opportunity of playing any part in affairs. The rest either died young or succeeded young. Through the whole sixteenth century there were crowds of people who had contingent claims to the crown, but they were not people whom anybody would have called royal. The "royal family," as a working institution, really takes a leap from the son of Henry the Fourth to the son and grandson of George the First—is it too bitter a sarcasm to say, from John Duke of Bedford to Frederick Prince of Wales? Between these there was only a prince or a princess now and then. It was no wonder then that, when the "royal family" began again, they started on quite new terms. And after all, no one has ever told us what is the royal family. No one has yet been further off the reigning sovereign than first cousin. The status of the more distant kinsfolk has never been fixed, because no case has ever arisen to call for its being fixed. We trust that the line of the Dukes of Connaught may not die out so soon as the lines of so many other royal dukedoms have died out. But we should greatly like to know—it is not the first time that we have put the question—what the son of a younger son of the present Duke will be called. Unless the reigning sovereign specially bestows some rank or title on him, it looks very much as if he will come into the world without even a surname, and will be nothing at all till he becomes a Christian or otherwise obtains a *prænomen*.

CHAMOUNI GUIDES.

THE *Times* prefaces an article upon the guides of Chamouni by the remark that certain recent proceedings at the headquarters of mountain-climbing may have greater interest for many

people than the French Ministerial crisis. The fact is indisputable. Many people during the past week have taken more interest in the health of a dozen racehorses than in the food-supplies of the Indian population. Any trifle which touches us personally will naturally, and within certain limits rightfully, engage our attention much more decidedly than the greater events which have little direct influence upon our affairs. And, moreover, the Chamouni question, though it certainly is a small one as compared with the political interests of a great country, is one which really deserves some consideration. The valley of Chamouni has not a large population; but within its narrow limits we may observe the development of a process which affects the happiness and morality of a very large number of people. The article in the *Times* gives the most obvious view of the question as it presents itself to the British tourist; but it requires modification before we can accept it as accurate. The writer, indeed, begins with a remark calculated to shock our faith in the intimacy of his knowledge. "Although," he says, "politically Chamouni has ceased to be Swiss, it continues to be the climbing capital of the country." Many people talk of Chamouni as now forming a part of Switzerland; and we may congratulate the writer on his having discovered that doctrine to be erroneous. As he pursues his researches he may possibly discover that it never was in Switzerland, but formed part of a certain region not unfrequently mentioned by historical and geographical writers under the name of Savoy. We are afterwards told that, "in an evil moment," the authorities betook themselves to that organizing "of which the French are so fond," and formed a Company of guides. However fond the French may be of organizing, the Chamouni Company had been formed long before Savoy was a French province, and in the good old days when the traveller encountered the gendarme on the summit of the Forclaz, he was pretty certain, if he was a mountaineer, to have a difficulty with the *chef guide* at Chamouni afterwards. The Chamouni Company is much more like an English Trade Union than a specimen of French organization. In most Alpine districts the same system has been more or less adopted, though circumstances have given a special prominence to this particular association. The result of the annexation to France was simply that a new code of rules was imposed upon the Chamouni guides, partly in deference to certain appeals from the Alpine Club; and these rules are very much more favourable to travellers than the previously existing regulations. In the old days, as people not very old can distinctly remember, it was next to impossible for travellers to ascend Mont Blanc without a little army composed of four guides and four porters, who were taken by rotation from the roll of guides just as they are at the present time. The energy of a few travellers who found a way up Mont Blanc for themselves, and who introduced guides from other districts, broke down the old monopoly to a considerable extent, and the new rules sanctioned their innovation. At the present day, a large category of persons, including, for example, all members of Alpine Clubs and travellers who have made difficult expeditions, are exempt from the rules altogether. They can take what guides they please, and as many or as few as they please. And therefore, so far from the excessive French organization being at the root of the evil, the action of the French *régime* has been to relax the rules of which so many complaints have been made, and, indeed, if paper regulations were always effectual, would have removed every possible ground of objection. And yet it is, we fear, undeniable that the character of the guides has steadily deteriorated, and that whereas, twenty years ago, Chamouni men enjoyed the highest reputation throughout the whole of the Alps, they are now rarely taken by the most experienced travellers even for their own mountains. The aspiring mountaineer would find half a dozen better men in one little village near Meiringen than he could find on the whole of the Chamouni roll. The protective system of the Chamouni cannot, therefore, be fairly charged with the whole of the evil, for the evil has increased contemporaneously with the relaxation of the old restrictions. It is desirable that this should be clearly understood, inasmuch as the misconceptions implied in the *Times*' article go very far to suggest changes in an entirely wrong direction.

If, then, it should be asked what is the root of the evil, the answer is not far to seek, and indeed is partly indicated in the *Times*' article. The great influx of travellers to Chamouni has had many bad effects upon the character of the people. They have been corrupted by the reckless expenditure of money by thoughtless tourists. A man can earn a hundred francs by an ascent of Mont Blanc. Now, though the *Times*' article blunders again in assuming that the ascent of Mont Blanc is always easier than that of the Finsteraarhorn or Matterhorn, it is undoubtedly a very simple matter in fine weather and under favourable conditions of the snow. Under other circumstances it still is and always must be one of the most dangerous mountains in the Alps, because the most exposed. Still the temptation to make what is a large sum for a poor peasant by a couple of days' very moderate labour is considerable. A large number of the more able-bodied men are therefore tempted to hang about Chamouni for the purpose of drawing a prize in the lottery. An able-bodied man who hangs about a village full of inns has very obvious temptations, and it is unpleasantly common to find that the porter whom you have engaged for a day's expedition has palpably spent the night in a highly festive spirit, and is apt to collapse suddenly on a snow-slope after three or four hours' climbing. This particular evil is indicative of a number of ways in which the chance of earning a large sum acts prejudicially on the character of

the people. They are encouraged to prey upon tourists instead of trusting to regular labour, and have invented a number of devices for plundering the unsuspecting traveller which would be amusing if the consequences were not serious. Under such influences, which are sufficiently notorious in similar cases, the careless expenditure of hurrying tourists, many of whom only come once in their lives for a few days, and know no more of the population than a railway traveller knows of the guard of his train, has converted a large number of the people into drunken idlers. It is lamentable that this should be so, and the more lamentable because it is not very easy to see the remedy. The Chamouni people are by no means without their virtues; they are generally honest, if honesty means abstinence from direct cheating; and they are civil and good-tempered. Still they form a kind of tacit confederation for extracting the maximum from the pockets of their visitors at the minimum of labour for themselves. In the German-speaking districts of the Alps the same evils are to be found; but in those districts there are certain counterbalancing advantages. The people are more independent and more enterprising. Guides take more trouble to qualify themselves for their duty by distinguishing themselves in difficult expeditions. New inns are built for the accommodation of travellers, and greater comforts provided. The cunning but cautious Chamouniard is content to keep up his old dirty taverns at the Montanvert and elsewhere, and to make profit by the simple system of exorbitant charges; and the guides seem disposed to take advantage of the increased demand for their services, not by improving themselves as mountaineers, but by taking it more easily and asking the same price. Whether evils of this kind can be removed by any new regulations or by the action of the Alpine Clubs is not a very simple question. Certainly there is not much hope that the mischief will be cured, as the *Times* seems to anticipate, in the course of a season or two, or by a new code of rules. Still something may be done, and Alpine Clubs, especially the French Club which has been recently founded, may encourage whatever good tendencies exist amongst the people.

The proposals which have been recently made by the English Alpine Club are well meant, and it may be worth while to point out their nature. The regulations of the Chamouni Company are, as we have said, very good upon paper. The much-abused system of rotation is not, we must remark, so objectionable as is sometimes suggested. For ordinary purposes, that is to say, for about ninety-nine expeditions in a hundred, it is by far the most convenient plan. For the ordinary tourist's walk one guide is as good as another; and the alternative to a system of rotation is simply a system of touting. An average tourist in other districts takes the man recommended by the innkeeper, or, it may be, the man who has waylaid him by the road. In Chamouni he takes the man according to his place on the roll; and it is no small comfort that he is therefore free from the importunities of the loafers who frequently beset him in the Oberland. So long as admission to the Company is confined to competent men, there is little ground for complaint; and the Chamouni regulations declare that no man is to be admitted who has not undergone a searching examination. But, it is said, travellers who attempt difficult expeditions should be able to select the best men. This, too, though the *Times* does not seem to know it, is amply provided for in the regulations. If travellers cared to exercise their privileges, they would be enabled to pick and choose the most experienced guides at pleasure. Of course when a traveller who has never seen a mountain before wants to have the glory of ascending Mont Blanc, he is generally ignorant of his rights, and takes the first man sent to him who happens to be in order for service. But such travellers would be equally incompetent, and would in all probability be as badly served, if there were no regulations at all, and if they consequently trusted to the innkeeper or to chance. The Alpine Club, therefore, has not proposed the abolition of the regulations, but has asked for securities that they may be carried out more according to the spirit. The examination, it is said, is worthless. Practically anybody is admitted who wishes to be admitted, and the consequence is that the Company of guides has been swamped by all the idlers and ineffectives in the valley. The root of the evil, so they suggest, is in the election of the chief guide by the general body of guides. He becomes dependent upon his constituents, and unwilling to offend anybody by enforcing regulations strictly. The examination has thus become a mere farce; and the chief guide is quite as likely to be a man who has been a popular tavernkeeper as a man with any real knowledge of his profession. The Club, therefore, proposes that the chief guide should be appointed by some superior authority, and so placed in an independent position. Further, in order to facilitate the exercise of some discrimination by travellers, they propose that the guides should be divided into two classes, according as they have or have not sufficient experience of difficult expeditions. The discrimination would clearly impose an onerous duty upon the authorities, whose independence is therefore all the more necessary. Finally, it is suggested that by some device, such as keeping a register of expeditions easily open to inspection, the traveller should have some means of knowing what has really been done by the men whom he employs. This want is in some degree met already by the book which every guide has to carry about him; but a public register would doubtless enable the traveller to see more easily who were the available persons for employment.

These proposals, whatever their result, are not opposed, it may be observed, to the French "love of organizing." They are designed to make the organization more efficient, and are directed in favour of centralization as opposed to self-government. It would be absurd to suppose that they strike at the root of the evil. Indeed they

could not produce any great effect without the intelligent co-operation of travellers themselves. So long as people are content to undertake an expedition which may involve very serious risk to life without examining the antecedents of their companions, it may be feared that the unintelligent demand will be met by a supply of very poor quality. And this remark suggests that travellers should be impressed as much as possible with a sense of their duty towards the population which they treat so carelessly, and so frequently corrupt. The extravagant liberality displayed both by chance travellers and by enthusiasts who have a superstitious belief in the virtues of their pet guides does much to demoralize the people. We may, however, admit that the proposed changes are aimed in the right direction, whatever their efficacy. They aim at proving to the guides of Chamouni that it is worth their while to become really competent members of their profession. If they are capable of taking the lesson, they may regain the reputation which has now departed from them; and we earnestly hope that they will show themselves amenable to reason. There are still some good men amongst them, and we would hope that there may be enough to form a nucleus for the growth of a sounder public opinion.

FEMALE SUFFRAGE.

THE article on "Female Suffrage" which Mr. Goldwin Smith has written in *Macmillan's Magazine* is a weighty declaration of opinion against a party with which on other questions the writer has been, and perhaps still is, allied. Mr. Goldwin Smith still maintains in theoretical politics the language of an advanced Liberal, although on the practical point with which he deals he is emphatically Conservative. He has been to the United States, and has seen and heard the advocates of woman's rights, and thus he has been led to decide against them. We care little whether his arguments in support of this decision be good or bad, as no argument on the other side will mitigate the fact that he was induced to declare against female suffrage by the disgust which he felt for its supporters. He has seen, and, having seen, he ought to know. Mrs. Woodhull and her allies, who are merely names to us, are formidable realities to him. The very moderation of his language adds force to the condemnation which he delivers. It is alleged, he says, that female influence would mitigate the violence of party politics, but he thinks that both reason and experience point to the opposite conclusion. "In the Reign of Terror, and in the revolt of the Commune, the women notoriously rivalled the men in fury and atrocity. The same was the case in the late American Civil War. What has been the effect of public life on the character of the women who have thrown themselves into it in the United States can be doubted by no human being; and our experience of female agitations in this country seems to tell pretty much the same tale." The truth is, that no man of education and refinement, be his politics what they may, could help being repelled by a thorough-going politician of the other sex. In the United States, says Mr. Goldwin Smith, the grievance of which most is heard is the tyrannical stringency of the marriage tie, which, it is alleged, gives a man property in a woman, and unduly interferes with the freedom and genuineness of affection. "Some of the language used is more startling than this, and if reproduced might unfairly prejudice the case." Almost all English men and women would be startled at this language, and would be likely to decide the case against the side which uses it. Indeed the impression which one gets from reading reports of speeches of those American ladies who have "thrown themselves into" politics is that the speakers are a sort of wild animals who should be put into an island by themselves, and allowed to eat each other up. Any men who wished to join the "happy family" on that island might be allowed to do so.

It may perhaps have occurred to Conservative leaders to rejoice when they meet a young and ardent Radical, because experience shows that he is excellent material for making a middle-aged Tory. In the same way the consistent opponents of the late Mr. Mill must think it fortunate that Mr. Goldwin Smith was at one time numbered among his followers. Next to his contact with female politicians in America, the reading of Mr. Mill's *Autobiography* has had the greatest influence in deciding him against the views which Mr. Mill advocated. He states that he once signed a petition for female household suffrage got up by Mr. Mill, and he proceeds to explain how he has changed his mind. "He had not, when he signed the petition, seen the public life of women in the United States." It would be difficult to increase the force of this simple statement. Indeed the frank and ingenuous character of the whole article, while it ought to protect the writer from the taunts of the party he has joined, adds cogency to its condemnation of the party he has left. He tells us that Mr. Mill's *Autobiography* has revealed the history of his extraordinary and almost portentous education, the singular circumstances of his marriage, his hallucination as to the unparalleled genius of his wife, and peculiarities of character and temperament which prevented him from appreciating "the power of influences which, whatever our philosophy may say, reign and will continue to reign supreme over questions of this kind." Here, again, we cannot but admire the gentle force of Mr. Goldwin Smith's style. We have heard that an enthusiastic admirer of Mr. Mill expounded his views of society from the hustings to a rustic audience, and provoked a commentary equal in force, but far inferior in elegance

to that of Mr. Goldwin Smith. We may, indeed, safely leave Mr. Mill where Mr. Goldwin Smith has placed him. If Mr. Mill's authority is taken away from the movement for female suffrage, there is no substantial support left to it, and Mr. Mill committed a sort of intellectual suicide by writing his own life. "To him," says Mr. Goldwin Smith, with involuntary but trenchant satire, "marriage was the union of two philosophers in the pursuit of truth; and in his work on the position and destiny of women, not only does he scarcely think of children, but sex and its influences seem hardly to be present to his mind." The American ladies whose language Mr. Goldwin Smith finds "startling" and likely to prejudice their case may perhaps be not unfairly described as the philosophical complement of Mr. Mill. They say enough, and even too much, about matters which he seems to have forgotten. But neither Mr. Mill nor his female allies can stand before the crushing blows of Mr. Goldwin Smith, nor will the cause for which they have vainly striven be greatly helped by Mr. Forsyth or even by Mr. Disraeli.

It will be difficult for the Conservative leader to show that Mr. Goldwin Smith is not a better Conservative of the social life of the civilized world than he is, and perhaps a new edition of *Lothair* may be required to demonstrate this point satisfactorily. Many passages of the article before us are to our mind Conservatism in its best sense. Take, for instance, the writer's view of history. If, he says, the woman has had her sorrows at home, the man has had his wars and his rough struggles with nature abroad. If the woman has had her disabilities, she has also had her privileges. "War has spared her; for if in primitive times she was made a slave, this was better, in the days before sentiment at least, than being massacred." Take, again, his account of the present condition of women in America. Their privileges, he says, extend to impunity, not only for ordinary outrage, but for murder. A prisoner whose guilt has been clearly proved is let off because she is a woman. The whisky crusade shows that woman is above the law. "Rioting and injury to the property of tradesmen, when committed by the privileged sex, are hailed as a new and beneficent agency in public life; and because the German population, being less sentimental, asserts the principles of legality and decency, the women are said to have suffered martyrdom." It would be difficult to surpass either the accuracy or the felicity of this description of recent proceedings in America. In another striking passage Mr. Goldwin Smith notices that there have been intimations, on the part of the women of the United States, of a desire to make very lavish use of capital punishment untrammelled by the technical rules of evidence, for offences or supposed offences against the sex. We may observe by way of commentary on this passage that hardly an assize occurs in England without at least one trial for what is called a "rape" which is really an attempt by a woman to vindicate her character by perjury. It is difficult enough sometimes, even with the help of the technical rules of evidence, to defeat these attempts, nor can it be doubted that under precisely similar circumstances some men have been hanged for rape, while other men have paid pecuniary penalties for seduction. The Professor, however, does not apprehend that in America or any other country men would go on allowing women to hang them for "offences against the sex." But he apprehends that, as men supply the force on which law rests, this force would be withdrawn, and all law would fall together. In England he thinks that women, in order to reform drunken husbands, would vote for extreme prohibitory measures against liquor, and the difficulty of carrying such legislation into effect, which is great already, would be increased by the fact that it had originated with women. In France, if votes were given to women, he anticipates as the first result "the restoration to power of the Bourbons, with their reactionary priesthood, and the destruction of all that has been gained by the national agonies of the last century." Even those who may think that little has been gained would probably join Mr. Goldwin Smith in wishing that that little should be preserved. To introduce female suffrage into France would be to make confusion worse confounded. It would add another element of disorder where there are too many already. In fact, it is only with ourselves and America that such experiments can even be proposed. We of the English-speaking race alone have that strength of political constitution which can bear to have played with it. As for Germany, Mr. Goldwin Smith conclusively remarks that a woman can never be a full citizen in countries where it is part of a citizen's duty to bear arms. If this duty could be imposed upon citizens in England, many advantages would result, and among them this, that the agitation for female suffrage would, or at least ought to, terminate.

It is remarkable that the *Daily News*, in endeavouring to answer Mr. Goldwin Smith's article, admits that objection to female suffrage is felt by men in proportion to their attachment to political and religious liberty, and that the influence of female voters would for some time to come be mainly thrown into the scale of Conservatism. It is possible that this might be so, but if in this expectation so-called Conservatives support Mr. Forsyth's Bill, they will sacrifice the permanent interest of their party to temporary expediency. Mr. Goldwin Smith is undoubtedly right in saying that the line could not be maintained where Mr. Forsyth would now draw it. Not merely unmarried women being householders, but all women, would obtain the franchise, and "those at least who hold the family to be worth as much as the State will think twice before they concur in such a change." We must say that this is true Conservatism, and we think that the remedy for much

that is wrong in modern society is to be found in acting upon this idea of the value of the family. "The expensiveness of living in a country where the fashion is set by millionaires has put extraordinary difficulties in the way of marriage." If it were possible to change the fashion, and thus to remove the difficulty, nature might be trusted to do the rest. Girls in general, if they had a fair choice, would rather be mothers than philosophers, and the choice when once made would be irrevocable. Perhaps this very expensiveness of living may increase until it gradually works a cure of the evil it has created. If servants become very dear, a man may perceive that it would be cheaper to take a wife. The limited and transient success of the movement for female suffrage is due to causes which are exceptional, and, as we would hope, temporary. At any rate we are not surprised to learn that Mr. Goldwin Smith found that this movement "was received with mistrust by some of the best and most sensible women of his acquaintance." Sir Henry James is reported—whether rightly or wrongly we will not inquire—to have said that when half the ladies of Taunton appealed to him to support female suffrage he would do it; and we think that at any rate he may safely wait until the movement has reached that point, and then consider what he ought to do.

THE FARM LABOURERS' CATECHISM.

THOSE who are surprised that the farmers should exhibit so much resentment against the Agricultural Labourers' Unions, and should receive with distrust the overtures of self-appointed arbiters who are identified with these associations, such as Mr. Morley and Mr. Dixon, should look a little beneath the surface of the movement. An explanation will perhaps be supplied by remembering that the Unionists were the original assailants, and by observing the spirit in which they have thrown themselves into the attack on the farmers. The campaign of the Unionists is by no means limited to a mere question of wages or hours of labour; if that had been all, it might soon have been brought to an amicable termination. It has taken unfortunately a wider range. The object of the agitators who work behind or through the Unions would appear to be to inspire the labourer with vindictive feelings against those above him, and to commit him to a policy of irreconcilable hatred and hostility. We have before us a small tract which, we understand, has been largely circulated among the labourers of Essex. It is called the *Farm Labourers' Catechism*, and on the title-page we read that it has been "prepared for the special use of those agricultural labourers who are not in the Union." It may be inferred that those who are already members are supposed to stand in no need of the sort of stimulant which is here supplied. It is also stated on the title-page that the author of this Catechism is the Chairman of the North Essex District of the National Agricultural Labourers' Union, and that the work itself can be procured at the office of the N.A.L.U. at Halsted. This is, therefore, an official publication. It is written by a prominent official of the Union, and is sold at the offices of the Society. We may consequently accept it as an authoritative exponent of the spirit and objects of the body in whose name it is issued. It is perhaps characteristic that a document of this kind should take the form of a blasphemous parody of the Church Catechism. We say nothing, however, of the outrage on good taste and decency, to put it on the lowest ground, which is thus committed. It is with the sentiments which are propagated in this work that we are chiefly concerned.

The *Catechism*, beginning "What is your name?" with the answer "Clodhopper," goes on to give the following answer to the next question, "Who gave you that name?"—"My masters, the landowners and farmers, when I was made a tiller of the soil, a scarer of birds, a snagger of turnips, a keeper of cows and sheep, a follower of the plough, a sower and reaper, a producer of wealth, that my masters might live in idleness and luxuriousness all the days of their lives." In another answer the labourer says he is truly grateful to the landlords and farmers "that they have condescended in their great mercy even to permit me to till the soil for their benefit, that I may have the pleasure of witnessing their prosperity and happiness in living on the fruits of my toil; that pleasure being increased by the contrast of our wives and children perishing with starvation on the wage which they so kindly and generously give us for our toil." The Commandments are travestied in a similar manner. Here are one or two of them:—

III.

Thou shalt not take my name in vain, nor speak disrespectfully of my ways, for I am on the Bench of Magistrates, and will bring down the law upon thy head, and by imprisonment with hard labour satisfy my vengeance at the expense of the country; therefore take heed lest ye break my commandments.

V.

Honour the squire, the landowners, the farmers, the magistrates, the guardians of the poor, the bailiff, and the gamekeeper, that thy days may be long spared to enjoy such blessings.

VI.

If thy children have not sufficient food, clothing, or shelter, and they die in consequence thereof, thou shalt not call this murder.

VII.

If a landowner, farmer, or parson assail the chastity of thy wife or daughter, and seduce them from the paths of virtue, thou shalt not call this adultery, but be thankful for their condescension in thus honouring thee.

IX.

If in thy work thy master does not give thee so much money as he agreed

with thee for, taking advantage when measuring thy work, thou shalt not call this stealing, but thou shalt be thankful that he has given thee what he has.

X.

Thou shalt not look with feelings of envy upon thy master's wife, his sons, his daughters, his oxen, his ass, his dog, nor his cat, nor contrast their condition in life with thine; thou shalt not covet neither the fine garments, food, or dwellings of thy master, for these things were not made for such as thou art, but for those set in authority over thee.

What follows is too blasphemous for quotation; but we have given enough to show the sort of poisonous seed which the Unionists have been engaged in sowing. It may be said that this is only very coarse and stupid fun, and that it indicates nothing more than a deplorable want of taste. If the publication had emanated from the labourers themselves, there might perhaps have been something in this excuse. But this is not the casual composition of an obscure and isolated labourer. It is a tract written by a District Chairman expressly for Union purposes, and deliberately published and circulated under the direct authority of the National Union and by means of its agents. Moreover it is not the form of the parody—odious as it is—as the malignant and mischievous spirit of the whole pamphlet, which makes its publication, especially at a time when it was desirable to bring together the labourers and their employers in a conciliatory mood, so serious an offence. The *Catechism*, it must be remembered, does not stand alone. The speeches of the Unionist delegates have been habitually much more violent than the newspapers have given any idea of; and it is not long since the official journal of the National Union openly preached the doctrines of Captain Swing. It is true that one or two of the more cautious members of the Association were alarmed by the probable consequences of this outspoken language; but the journal never retracted what it had said; the Council of the Union did not repudiate the incendiary which had been published in its name; nor, as far as we are aware, did the members who had protested retire from the Association.

It is creditable to the great body of the labourers that the violent and unscrupulous instigations of the agitators whom they have accepted, on their own offer, as the rulers of the Unions have not as yet had any practical effect. It is known, however, that the mind of the labourer is slow in catching fire, and there is no saying what may some day be the consequences of these insidious inflammatory addresses. In any case the incendiary who lays the train is not to be excused because, when he applies the match, he finds the powder damp. Even if the speeches and literature of which the *Catechism* is a fair example have not hitherto done much harm, it is quite clear that they were intended to do harm, and the farmers may be excused for resenting the intention without waiting to judge by the result. In this instance the agitators had the advantage of discovering a sufficiently solid basis of misery and discontent to work upon. Nobody can pretend that the position of the agricultural labourers is satisfactory. They have been for some time in a transition stage between the old system of domestic dependence on their employers and the new system of so much pay for so much work and nothing more. It may be well that the labourers should take their chance in the world like other workmen, but nobody who had any acquaintance with their circumstances could doubt that a sudden and violent assertion of their independence would be certain to recoil most severely on themselves. The system of which they complain, whatever may be said for or against it, has been the growth of generations, and cannot be revolutionized all in a minute. The difficulty of the case is, that if the farmer has to pay higher wages, he must seek a better class of workmen than those whom he now employs, and it is on the latter that the blow will fall. It is not the labourers' fault that in many cases they have sunk into such a state of inefficiency; but then neither is it the farmers'. It is possible that political motives may have had their influence in shaping the tactics of the originators of the Unions, and that the *Farm Labourers' Catechism* was designed as a fitting introduction to the extended franchise. However that may be, it is at least certain that nothing can be more disastrous for the immediate interests of the labourers than that the farmers and landlords should be attacked with so much personal bitterness and malignity that they can hardly avoid standing at bay. There is an old proverb which Mr. Morley and some of his friends may perhaps have heard in their rural rambles, and on which it may be worth their while to meditate. It is that you cannot run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. In other words, it is idle for a prominent supporter of the National Agricultural Labourers' Union to offer his friendly services to the farmers while at the same time the National Union is scattering broadcast venomous and incendiary pamphlets with a view to persuade the labourers that they ought to take personal vengeance on their employers. We have of course no intention of fastening on Mr. Morley himself any responsibility for this pestilent production, of the existence of which, indeed, he may possibly be ignorant; and it can hardly be doubted that he will disavow it when it is brought to his notice. It has been Mr. Morley's misfortune, although personally no doubt an amiable and moderate person, to find himself continually playing into the hands of firebrands whose projects go far beyond his own, and whom it is difficult to control. After so many warnings he can perhaps hardly be surprised to learn that his usual fate has again befallen him; and that when he went, in the simplicity of his heart, to offer the olive-branch to the farmers, his more reckless associates were doing all they could behind his back to irritate and alarm the class whom it was necessary to conciliate. It is natural perhaps that public-spirited men like Mr.

Morley, Mr. Mundella, and other volunteer arbiters should be anxious to distinguish themselves on these occasions, but it is difficult to reconcile the political character which they have chosen to adopt with the rigid impartiality of an umpire, and at any rate there is no reason to be surprised that, after having openly sympathized with one side, they should be suspected by the other.

THE OLD CATHOLIC SYNOD.

WE have not heard very much lately about the doings of the Old Catholics in Germany. Whether they thought that, while Prince Bismarck was in one sense doing their work for them so effectually, they might rest on their laurels, or whether it is merely that all ecclesiastical interest has been absorbed in the contest about the Falk laws, little has been reported for some months past of the progress of the movement. Last week however the First Old Catholic Synod assembled at Bonn, and sat from the 27th to the 29th of May under the presidency of Bishop Reinkens, consisting of 28 clerical and 57 lay delegates, and we naturally looked with some curiosity to the record of its proceedings. But the Synod sat with closed doors, and a bare outline of the results is all that has as yet been communicated to the public; nor can we reckon on learning more till an official Report is forthcoming, which may not be for several months. Meanwhile the little that is told us, taken in connexion with the previously reported action of local Committees, is enough to suggest grave doubt—it would perhaps be premature without fuller information to say more than doubt—as to how far the Old Catholic leaders are still moving on their original lines. It will be remembered that when the first Congress was held at Munich three years ago, the Tridentine creed was formally acknowledged as the doctrinal basis of the movement, and its adherents claimed to represent "the Catholic Church up to 1870," and indeed to be its sole faithful representatives. They earnestly disavowed all idea of separation, and insisted that they meant to preserve unchanged the faith in which they were brought up, and that they retained, and were resolved to retain, all rights and privileges appertaining to them as Catholics, whether spiritual or temporal; and on this express plea they based their civil claim to the retention of Church property, and the recognition of their Bishops and clergy, as Catholic Bishops and priests, by the State. In Prussia and in some other German States, as in Baden, that claim has been unreservedly, while in other States it has been partially, admitted. But it is obvious that its whole force depends on the unbroken identity of the Old Catholics with their former selves, or in other words with the great religious body to which they certainly belonged before the Vatican Council. The Roman Catholic Church might be in urgent need of reformation, and they might hope that it would be eventually led to reform itself under their influence, as in some respects it did reform itself in the sixteenth century. But they could hardly doubt that to break off from it and organize an independent reformation in general matters of Church discipline, and still more of doctrine, whether right or wrong—that is quite another question—would be simply to follow the precedent set by the Protestant separatists at that period, and was absolutely incompatible with the claim to remain Catholics in the same sense as before. Yet this is very much the position, so far as our present information enables us to judge, into which they appear to be drifting. We say advisedly "appear to be drifting," first because our information, as was observed just now, is incomplete, and secondly because there has certainly been no formal repudiation of the original programme put forward at the Munich Congress of 1871, still less any formal announcement of a different principle of action. As long ago, however, as 1872, when the Second Old Catholic Congress was held at Bonn, a distinguished English clergyman who had been invited to attend, and who had consequently written for more precise information about the principles of the movement, could get no reply. In the third Congress, held last year at Constance, there were evident symptoms of radical if not revolutionary tendencies among at least one section of the members. And still more decisive expression has been given to these tendencies since.

We are not now referring to the Swiss contingent of the Old Catholics, who have from the first shown a disposition to take the law into their own hands, and for whose eccentricities Bishop Reinkens and his colleagues cannot fairly be held responsible. When Father Hyacinthe two years ago disposed of the vexed question of clerical celibacy by marrying an American widow, and when somewhat later he settled another fundamental question of ecclesiastical discipline by rule of thumb, and announced that thenceforth he should say mass in French instead of Latin, he perhaps wished to be regarded as only acting for himself. Still it must be remembered that he continued—and, we suppose, still continues—to maintain his profession of Catholicism unchanged, and vehemently disclaimed any intention of accepting a Protestant position. It is not therefore irrelevant to observe that such matters as obligatory celibacy and the language of the liturgy can hardly be suffered by any Church, Catholic or Protestant, to be left to the arbitrary judgment of its individual ministers. Even the systematic license of Congregationalism would be severely strained by the absence of any fixed rule on such points as these. Yet it is said to have been proposed at Old Catholic meetings in Germany, held in anticipation of the recent Synod, to adopt not only the changes introduced by Father Hyacinthe, but further and still more sweeping measures

of reform, some of them directly affecting matters of doctrine. Thus resolutions have been passed in favour of abrogating the rule of clerical celibacy, of confession, and of fasting, abolishing all festivals of saints, except All Saints and All Souls' Day, discarding invocation of saints, and introducing a vernacular liturgy. And one at least of these suggestions, as will presently appear, has been definitely adopted by the Synod. Now we are not of course going to raise any question as to the theological or religious merits of these proposed innovations. We only say what is obvious, that they are innovations, and very important ones, and that they seem at first sight wholly beyond the competence of a community claiming to retain unbroken its organic connexion with the great body of the Roman Catholic Church. Two at least of the points at issue, regarding the duty of sacramental confession and the invocation of saints, directly involve doctrinal considerations. Clerical celibacy again, though a disciplinary and not a doctrinal matter, is one hardly admitting in practice of a different rule in different parts of the same religious community. It is true that the Uniate clergy, under the obedience of Rome, are allowed to marry, but then they are a very small minority, and practically do not come into contact with the great body of the Latin clergy at all. But it is hardly conceivable, for instance, that the Catholic clergy of Germany should be left free to marry, while their brethren in France and Italy remain bound by the rule of celibacy. If the rule is to be relaxed at all in the Roman Catholic Church, it surely stands to common sense that it must be relaxed universally, and not for this or that national or other division of the priesthood. And the present state of things in Prussia gives a more immediate significance to the attitude of the Old Catholics on such points as these. It is provided by the new laws that in vacant parishes—and more than 1,200 parishes are already legally vacant in the two dioceses of Cologne and Trèves alone—the parishioners shall elect their own incumbent, if the patron fails to present a duly qualified person within a prescribed interval. It might of course happen in such cases—and the provision was obviously made with that intention—that an Old Catholic priest should be elected. This actually occurred some months ago at Hirschberg in Silesia, but the Bishop of Breslau naturally refused to institute, and the law dispensing with episcopal institution had not then been enacted. In Baden again it has now been decided that Old Catholic priests are eligible to parochial cures. And we presume that Prince Bismarck looks to the prospect of filling up vacant bishoprics in the same way. But even he could hardly venture—certainly not without a fresh instalment of supplementary legislation—to force into Roman Catholic sees and parishes adherents of a body which had definitely abjured the doctrine and discipline of the Roman Catholic Church. This is just the position which the Old Catholics at first strenuously repudiated, but into which they seem to be on the eve of lapsing soon.

The First Old Catholic Synod sat, as we have mentioned, on the 27th, 28th, and 29th of May, the sessions being each day opened by the celebration of mass, followed on the first occasion by an address from Bishop Reinkens, and on the second by a discourse from Professor Reusch, on the deceased members of the body for whom the mass had been offered. On the third morning the Bishop solemnized his first ordination, conferring the minor orders and subdiaconate on one of his theological students. The synodal and parochial organization provisionally approved at the Congress of Constance last autumn was adopted *en bloc* on the first day, after which Schulte read a report on the present condition of the Old Catholic movement, which, we presume, will be eventually published. And then followed the discussion of the project of reform drawn up by the Synodal Council. It appears to have dealt chiefly with confession, fast days, the catechism and liturgy, and the laws of marriage. As regards the first point, the Sacrament of Penance was declared by the Synod to be a great means of grace, always existing in the Church, but not necessary to salvation, and therefore its use was ruled to be optional; it is rather oddly added that confession ought not to be made the occasion of seeking advice and direction from the confessor, though the penitent is at liberty to do so if he wishes. This synodal decree involves, it will be seen, a fundamental innovation on the received teaching and practice of the Roman Catholic Church. The rule of annual confession dates from the fourth Lateran Council of 1215, but is based of course on a much older belief. What changes were made in the observances of fast-days, and in the catechism and liturgy, does not appear; but resolutions were passed at the Synod on all these subjects. As regards marriage, the elaborate system of dispensations was simplified, and the rule about the education of the children of mixed marriages in the Catholic religion was abolished. Freiburg im Breisgau was fixed as the place for the meeting of the Old Catholic Congress of next autumn. At the close of the proceedings Dr. Döllinger's health was drunk with much enthusiasm and a telegram was despatched to him, in return apparently for the greetings he had commissioned Dr. Friedrich to deliver in his name to the Synod. But how far the Nestor of the movement, as he has been termed, may approve of the line it is now taking remains to be seen. He studiously absented himself last autumn from the Congress of Constance, and it is highly improbable, from the attitude he has throughout maintained, that he would give his countenance to any course involving a deliberate breach with the great body of the Church. His aim has all along been to promote the gradual introduction of internal reforms, not the organization of a schism, and it was only as a temporary and provisional measure that he acquiesced in the consecration

'of a *Nothbischof* and the formation of new parochial cures. Of course he may have changed his mind, or the movement may have got beyond his control, or there may be some exaggeration in the current reports about it. But its enemies will certainly be the first to rejoice at any manifestation of a tendency to abandon the vantage ground it first assumed and fall back on the humbler, though possibly more exciting, position of an independent sect. That game has been played so often, both in Germany and elsewhere, that it has lost its interest for outsiders. Ultramontanes taunted the Old Catholics from the first with being only New Protestants in disguise. Protestantism may be an excellent thing, but its novelties are by this time pretty well exhausted, and Protestants who cannot make themselves at home in any of the existing sects must be rather hard to please. Meanwhile it would clearly be the wisdom of the anti-infallibilist Catholics, if they still cherish the lofty designs announced in their original programme, to show that the taunt of their adversaries is undeserved. The movement is passing through a very critical stage, and the direction impressed on it during the next few months may be practically decisive of its future.

HOSPITAL SUNDAY.

HOSPITAL Sunday will soon be round again, and, as it promises to become an established institution, it may be worth while to consider a little more carefully than has apparently yet been done the circumstances under which the appeal is made. It may be assumed that the line which will be taken in most of the pulpits will be to expatiate on the misery and distress of a large part of the population of London, on the immense good which is done by timely and skilful medical attention, and on the general duties of charity and benevolence. We need hardly say that with everything that can be urged on these heads we heartily concur. Of all the forms of charity, medical charity is perhaps that which is most urgently required, and which is also most successful in its operations. There is no class on whom charity may be so usefully and appropriately bestowed as the sick poor, and the good which is thus done has a wide range of benignant influence far beyond its immediate recipients. From one point of view, indeed, charity in this shape might almost be regarded as a measure of self-interest. It is a sanitary precaution which operates for the benefit of the whole community; it checks the spread of disease, it keeps down pauperism, and it also contributes materially to the progress of medical science. The medical arrangements of the Poor Law system have been greatly amplified and improved in recent years, but they still leave, and, in the nature of things always must leave, much to be done by voluntary effort. On every ground, then, the medical charities, on behalf of which an appeal is to be made, deserve support, and so far the object which the promoters of the Hospital Sunday movement have in view is an excellent one. It does not follow, however, that the practical working of the movement is equally unimpeachable; and there are one or two considerations bearing on this point which ought not to be overlooked.

The chief argument in favour of Hospital Sunday is that it will bring in a larger sum of money for the support of hospitals and dispensaries than has hitherto been obtained, and it is not improbable that this will actually be the result, at any rate in the first instance. A general appeal of this kind, made simultaneously in a large number of churches, is perhaps more likely to cause excitement, and consequently to stimulate the flow of subscriptions, than scattered and isolated collections. It is possible, however, that when the novelty of the sensation has passed away the same effect may not be produced; and it is at least obvious that a comprehensive appeal of this kind, in which details are necessarily suppressed, and in which the various forms of medical charity are lumped together in a vague and featureless mass, is naturally destructive of that personal interest in particular institutions which is the best guarantee not only of continued support, but of close and efficient supervision. It will be said no doubt that what is expected is that people should contribute to the hospitals generally without discontinuing their gifts to such hospitals as they may happen to be specially interested in; but there is some reason to fear that, human nature being what it is, this expectation may not be very satisfactorily realized. Everybody can understand that an interest in hospitals generally is likely to be a very vague and not very active feeling as compared with an interest in a particular establishment, with the affairs of which a subscriber is personally well acquainted. In a case of this kind we have to observe not merely the financial results of the new system, but its probable effect on the administration of the charities which it is intended to provide with funds. Hitherto each hospital has been supported by a body of subscribers who read its reports and paid more or less attention to its operations, and who were naturally led to consider whether their money yielded a satisfactory return. The managers of the hospital had to keep these persons in view; they were aware that, if their establishment was suspected of being inefficiently or extravagantly conducted, the subscriptions would be likely to fall off; and they had therefore the strongest motives, in addition to a sense of duty, for keeping everything in good order. Under the new system these personal ties will in a great degree be broken. The subscribers will give, not to this or that institution, but to medical charity in the abstract. The hospitals, on the other hand, will receive the money, not from persons who are known to them, but from an anonymous public. There will be no longer any

sort of relation between the way in which the hospitals are managed and the amount of support which they will receive. The gifts will come, not as direct rewards for special exertions, but as the result of a general impulse of charity, which has been evoked on grounds quite distinct from the merits of particular institutions. It will be just as if the managers of the hospitals were assured that on a particular day of the year so much money would, as matter of course, fall to them from the clouds, and that they could, within certain limits, calculate on this as a fixed and permanent revenue which would be certain to come quite independently of any efforts on their part. At present the managers are responsible to individual subscribers; henceforth, if Hospital Sunday is regularly established, they will be practically responsible to nobody at all. The Committee of Distribution at the Mansion House has undertaken to distribute the money collected among the different hospitals and dispensaries, but there is no one to see that the money so paid is properly expended. The Committee has no means of exercising supervision over the various charities, and no authority to enforce any measures which it might think desirable. It is merely an agency for paying over to the managers the money which has been subscribed by the anonymous benevolence of the congregations. It would appear, therefore, that we are coming to this—that an irresponsible body of hospital managers will have paid over to them annually, with something like the regularity of a Government grant, a vast sum of money which will be at their disposal to be employed in any way they choose, without check or supervision, and for which they will not be bound to render any account. Whether this state of things is likely to promote the true interests of the charities may, we think, reasonably be doubted.

We should be sorry to say anything in disparagement of the gentlemen who have the management of the various medical charities. They are no doubt, as a body, animated by the highest motives, and their personal integrity is unimpeachable. Still they are, after all, only human beings, and subject to the weaknesses of their kind; and there are one or two questions which irresistibly suggest themselves. Has it ever in the experience of the world been found to answer to entrust a large income intended to be applied to public purposes to irresponsible officials? Are the hospitals which have the largest assured incomes, and which are consequently most independent, those which, as a rule, are most carefully and economically managed? Even as it is, under the supervision of private subscribers who can punish misconduct by withdrawing their contributions, the administration of many of the hospitals and dispensaries is very far from being satisfactory. In some cases the expenditure is excessive; in others the interests of the class for which hospitals are supposed to be specially established—the sick poor—are thrown into the background. There seems to be a concurrence of authoritative professional testimony to the fact that a large proportion of the resources of some of the principal hospitals are wasted upon people who have no claim to gratuitous medical attendance; and there is also reason to suspect that the arrangements for professional education are occasionally allowed to encroach on the natural and legitimate province of the charity. A tendency to aggrandizement at the expense of efficiency requires to be jealously watched. Managers are constantly exposed to the temptation of trying to make as big a thing as possible of their establishment, with imposing buildings, a large staff, and everything on a large scale, including the expenses. They like to do what shopkeepers call a roaring business, to have a great crowd of patients always at their doors, and a great variety of cases passed through the wards. It may be doubted, however, whether in these large projects the proper objects of medical charity are not somewhat lost sight of. If these abuses exist at present, while hospitals and dispensaries are dependent for support on the opinion which is formed of their respective merits, they are hardly likely to be cured by relieving the managers from the moderate responsibility which now rests on them, and encouraging them to expect an income which has its origin, not in an appreciation of their efforts, but only in a vague feeling that it is proper to be charitable. Two things are essential for the prosperous management of an hospital—money, and the watchful interest and supervision of subscribers; and the tendency of Hospital Sunday will be unfavourable to the second of these conditions. It appears to us that the promoters of this movement have either gone too far or not far enough. They are taking away an important security for good management without making any endeavour to provide a substitute. It is possible that the Committee of Distribution might organize itself into a Committee of Supervision, and distribute the money entrusted to it, not merely on the principle of greasing the fat pig's ear, but with reference to the respective usefulness and necessities of the different claimants; but it is not certain that the claimants would accept the boon on these terms. As it is, the Committee is certainly in a false position. It is weakening the control of private subscribers over the hospitals by rendering the latter independent of them, without undertaking to exercise any corresponding control on its own account.

ADULTERATION.

THERE could hardly be a more striking illustration of the sort of callous effrontry which is produced by habitual dishonesty in the way of business than the attempt which has just been made on behalf of the grocers to obtain a judicial decision in favour of the practice of selling adulterated goods as genuine. That such

practices should exist at all is bad enough, but that they should be openly justified, and that it should be thought likely that a court of law would lend its authority to enforce them against the public, is certainly startling. It shows at least the deplorable confusion of mind into which tradesmen have fallen on the subject of commercial honesty. The shopkeeper at Birkenhead who has been punished for selling adulterated tea no doubt did only what he had always been in the habit of doing, and what he knew other shopkeepers did, and there was certainly no personal dishonesty, in the ordinary sense, on his part. There can be no doubt, however, that the act was intrinsically dishonest, and the fact that it is generally practised by the trade cannot possibly alter its quality. The *Times* in reporting this case observed that it raised an important question as to whether the sale as genuine of any article which is adulterated can be excused on the ground that the adulteration is known to the trade. Some of these days we shall perhaps have the people who manufacture and circulate counterfeit coin raising the important question whether the passing of leaden half-crowns and brass sovereigns can be excused on the ground that the trick is known to the trade. There was no dispute in this case as to the adulteration of the article. It was admitted that tea thickly coated with gypsum and Prussian blue had been sold as genuine green tea, and it was contended that this artificial and poisonous production must be accepted as genuine green tea simply because the grocers chose to call it so. The grocers argue that they have themselves no hand in the adulteration; they give an order to their agents for green tea, and they sell the article supplied to them under that name exactly as it comes to them from China. It appears that there is a Japanese green tea which is not painted in this manner, and we are under the impression that pure green tea is also to be got in China, though perhaps very little of it reaches this country. In any case, it may be assumed that the ordinary green tea of commerce is all coloured, and that grocers are in the habit of selling doses of gypsum and Prussian blue as genuine green tea. The magistrates before whom the case was taken in the first instance held that this constituted adulteration under the Act, inasmuch as the admixture of poisonous ingredients, though known to the trade, is not known to the public; and this decision has been supported by four out of five judges of the Court of Queen's Bench. Mr. Justice Quain dissented on the ground that the shopkeeper sold the only article known in the trade as green tea, and did not alter it in any way. If it had been a question between persons engaged in the trade, this would no doubt have been a very proper view to take of it; but the question really was, whether the outside public could be assumed to be acquainted with all the secrets of the trade—in short, as Mr. Justice Blackburn said, does a man when he asks for green tea at a shop mean that he wants gypsum and Prussian blue? It is impossible to imagine that any reasonable creature would knowingly desire to drink poison of this kind, and especially to pay a ridiculously high price for it; and the shopkeeper's plea, it should be observed, did not go the length of saying that the painting of the leaf was known to the public, but only that it was known to the trade.

The decision in this case seems to us a very sound one, and the principle involved in it may be thus stated—that tradesmen must be supposed to use the English language in its natural sense, and that the general public is not to be assumed to be acquainted with all the secrets of a trade. The manner in which commercial green tea is prepared has been repeatedly exposed, and there can be no doubt that it has very bad character. Still there are simple-minded people who continue to believe that there is such a thing as pure unadulterated green tea to be got at the shops, and they are therefore imposed upon when they are supplied with painted tea-leaves. If they want to drink gypsum and Prussian blue, they can make themselves sufficiently ill for a penny, whereas the spurious tea costs some 3s. a pound; but there is no reason to suppose that they want to drink this sort of nastiness at all. It is incredible that people who drink green tea can know how it is made, and it is disgraceful that tradesmen who possess this knowledge should have so long gone on selling it. If they wish to continue to do so they have only to label the article "Prussian-blue tea," and nobody will be able to interfere with them. But they have no right to call an article genuine when they know that it is not genuine merely because other people do so and it helps the sale. The idea of the grocers—and we fear it is an idea which is also prevalent in other trades—seems to be that they have a right to attach a professional esoteric meaning to a word, and to use the word in this sense in their dealings with the public. The adjective "commercial" is to be understood as prefixed to the name of every article in a shopkeeper's list, and this introduces a subtle and important qualification. Thus tea-leaves coated with paint, though not genuine green tea, are "genuine commercial green tea," and the public is expected to understand that it is not green tea, but commercial green tea, that is sold. The Court of Queen's Bench has condemned this practice, but the shopkeepers have the remedy entirely in their own hands, for they have only to label their packets "commercial," and to explain that what they mean by it is that any rubbish or poison may be called tea if the trade generally agree to commit the fraud. A tradesman can always protect himself against the penalties of the Adulteration Act by frankly taking the public into his confidence on the subject of the adulterations which he practises or accepts. It is obvious that, if the principle contended for in this instance on behalf of the tea-dealers had been sanctioned, it would have had a very wide application. It is known that a great deal of the tea of commerce is composed

of iron filings and dirt, and this is just as much a genuine article as painted tea. Besides, as Mr. Justice Blackburn remarked, if there is to be commercial tea, why may there not be commercial butter, made of course of anything but butter? There can be little doubt that this system of fictitious nomenclature extends to a large variety of articles of commerce. The coffee of commerce has an unpleasant resemblance to chicory, the mustard of commerce is chiefly composed of potato flour and turmeric, and the wine of commerce is remotely, if at all, connected with the juice of the grape. In some instances the magistrates have shown themselves disposed to accept the commercial theory of adulteration. Dr. Hassall has drawn attention to a case at Glasgow where pickles containing 0.11 per cent. of copper were held to be not adulterated, on the ground that copper has been detected in certain vegetable and animal substances; the material distinction being left out of sight, that in the latter case the quantity of copper was very minute, whereas the pickles contained a dangerous quantity of metallic poison. In another instance a London magistrate accepted as genuine the butter of commerce, although it was adulterated with a fourth part of water. The magistrate distinguished between water added to the butter and water not squeezed out of it, and held that the latter did not matter. This decision will of course operate as an encouragement to the manufacturers to leave as much water as possible in the butter, and Dr. Hassall says he has met with cases containing forty per cent. of water. Whatever the trade may think of articles thus adulterated, they are hardly what the public understands as genuine.

The Adulteration Act is an act which will necessarily always be difficult to work, and especially at the beginning. In the first place, authoritative testimony cannot always be obtained as to actual composition of the substance complained of. Some of the professional witnesses would appear to be not very well qualified for their work, and they are also apt to be prejudiced by personal interest or professional rivalry. And then, when the analysis of the substance has been settled, there is the difficulty of determining what constitutes adulteration as distinguished from the natural and necessary processes of manufacture. It is easy to conceive how, under these circumstances, if the Act were to be pressed too far it might be made intolerable. Adulteration has rooted itself too deeply in English trade to be got rid of all at once. Its eradication must in the nature of things be a slow and gradual process, and in this, as in some other cases, the more haste will perhaps prove to be the worse speed. Where there is really a doubt as to the composition of an article, or as to whether the introduction of foreign elements constitutes a fraudulent deception, the dealer ought undoubtedly to have the benefit of the doubt. But when it is clear that an article is adulterated, the excuse that the adulteration is known to the trade ought at once to be set aside. There may be cases in which a small shopkeeper may be made to suffer for the offences of others, but it is obvious that the public has no chance of protection against adulteration unless the retail dealer is made directly responsible for the quality of the articles which he supplies. He is not bound to guarantee that they are genuine; he can give notice that he sells merely what the wholesale people send him, and that he does not know whether they are pure or not. But if he takes upon himself to offer the goods as genuine, he must be made answerable for it. If he has been imposed upon, he has his remedy against the wholesale dealer who deceived him, and the wholesale dealer may be left to settle with the importer or original producer. A tradesman must be supposed to know his own business, and if he sells as genuine an article which is not genuine, he must take the consequences. The protection of the public would obviously be reduced to a mere farce if the shopkeeper could say, "Oh! I said it was genuine merely because I bought it as such," and if the wholesale importer or manufacturer could plead the custom of the trade to justify adulteration. What a customer has clearly a right to demand is that what he buys shall honestly answer to the description given of it, that genuine tea shall be real tea and nothing else, that mustard shall be mustard, and butter butter, and wine wine. It will invariably be found that the object of adulteration is simply to defraud the purchaser by mixing the genuine substance with some cheaper stuff, but a plausible pretext for adulteration is sometimes found in the argument that the genuine article is improved by these additions. In any case, however, the customer should be fairly told what he is buying. The great point to aim at is to teach tradesmen that they cannot be allowed to use words in a non-natural sense, however well this sense may be understood in the trade. They need not guarantee the purity of their goods unless they please, but if they do, they must be prepared to justify the use of such words as "pure" and "genuine" in their ordinary meaning.

THE ROYAL ACADEMY.

v.

THIS year the "Outsiders" are more than ever numerous and strong; indeed it is evident that many among them are equal, and some superior, to what may be called the average Academician. In fact, in the present day there are so many men who can turn out tolerably good work that a second Academy might easily be formed out of the first-class candidates for distinction. Among these a prominent place would be given to Mr. Storey, whose quiet manner, tender in unobtrusive greys, is in favourable contrast to the loud style and screaming colour of the majority of our contemporary painters, who seem determined to make what has

been called "a silent art" speak clamorously. "Grandmamma's Christmas Visitors" (521) has a quaint old-fashioned simplicity, spiced with quiet humour; it takes us pleasantly back to the days of our grandmothers. This artist has usually an agreeable and chatty way of telling a tale; his pictures run in parallel lines with the writings of Addison and Steele; they even have something in common with the *Essays of Elia*, though that is a book which stands almost alone in literature and art. We wish we could speak in terms of equal praise of Mr. Wynfield's "Visit from the Inquisitors" (546). This is history brought down to the standard of *genre*; the execution is on a level with that of Gerard Dow, the colour is unpleasantly brown and red. The artist is much more at home in a schoolroom of young ladies who are taken in the act of receiving "Instructions in Deportment—the Curtsey" (444). The colour is even worse than we could have feared from young ladies in their teens. Such scenes would appear to excite in the public mind somewhat of the same curiosity as peeps into convents or revelations of harem life. Accordingly, this picture attracts around it an eager crowd, amused by the story more than edified by the art. Mr. Yeames, R.A., living within the precincts of "the St. John's Wood school," is naturally allied to Mr. Storey and Mr. Wynfield. "The Appeal to the Podestà" (280) is a scene laid in the famous Florentine courtyard of the Bargello. The artist in his detailed realism of the magnificent stone stairs, with armorial bearings on the walls, has probably been aided by the admirable photographs which for years we have known in the shops of Florence. Indeed the picture is photographic even to a fault; it is almost too painstaking.

The non-Academicians, it has sometimes been pleaded, go so far to make the success of the Exhibition that they ought to command more consideration than they receive. Yet when we look around the walls, we can see little injustice to complain of; with few exceptions, a work badly hung is scarcely worth a nearer view, and pictures thrown out altogether are, as a rule, cared for only by partial friends and relatives. The following "outsiders" who are among the best in the class of *genre*, have certainly little to complain of, M. Tissot, whose sparkling but scattered, pleasing but superficial, compositions have obtained consideration in the Paris Salon, favours the Academy with "A Ball on Shipboard" (690). Again the artist nearly solves the most perplexing puzzles in perspective. Correggio was not more clever when he cooked his famous "hash of frogs" than is M. Tissot when he compounds this "topsy-turvydom" on shipboard. Signor Perugini will be remembered for "A Cup of Tea" (13); the lady in a brocaded dress with blue china before her is graceful in flow of line; altogether the picture is by its taste and execution a *bijou*. Mr. Watson, were he less ambitious of versatility, would inspire confidence by a composition so tender and true as "The Pet of the Common" (613). But of what avail is this delicate interview between a girl and a calf when we have to encounter anything so vulgar as "Only been with a Few Friends" (15)? Praise is due to Mr. Lidderdale for a literal and expressive study "1793—Proscribed" (81); also to Mr. Sain for a faithful study of "A Capri Girl" (1040); likewise to Miss Havers for a charming little child puzzling over a sum in arithmetic (635). Mr. Poingdestre, an artist long known in Italy, wins the line by "The Roman Cattle Market" (1398). The composition is intricate and crowded to confusion; we preferred in a former Exhibition cattle carts in the quarries of Carrara. Also on the line is another scene from Italy, "The Winged Pensioners of Assisi" (1414). Here Mr. F. W. W. Topham escaped his former meretriciousness, and yet retains sufficient sunshine and colour. Closer study might secure for this artist a sustained success.

The portraits this year are more numerous than ever, without the excuse of being of greater excellence. Mr. Millais, R.A., having diverted himself with landscapes and fancy figures, has no astounding "picture portrait" to show. But brilliant as heretofore is "Walter, son of Nathaniel de Rothschild, Esq., M.P." (95). "Still for a Moment" (484) has, if possible, more than the painter's accustomed strength of pallet; and the clever mannerism is carried rather far in a lady supposed to be in "A Day-dream" (1432). In both these pictures the pigments are loaded on with ultra opacity and dryness: the artist, falling into the fashion of the day, eschews the surface polish which varnish gives. In our opinion not a few of the pictures of the year suffer in consequence from deadness and sinking in of the colours. Mr. Sant might almost be mistaken for Mr. Millais in a charming figure of a little girl holding in her hands big rosy peaches just gathered from the tree (158). The same artist beats Mr. Buckner hollow in the way of a magnificent opalescent satin dress; yet the portrait of "Mrs. Charles M. Palmer" (239), supreme as a piece of drapery painting, suffers by a crude background of which we should have hoped only a German could have been guilty. A garish colour, inclining to contrast rather than to harmony, has been long the besetting sin of this popular portrait-painter. Mr. Buckner is not himself, yet he is nothing worse than weakly innocuous, in the full length of "Mrs. Leslie, with Mary, Constance, Theodosia, and Olive Leslie" (255). Mr. Prinsep we have never seen so quiet as in "Miss L'Estrange" (274); this portrait has style and refinement. Mr. Archer, too, in several pictures distinguished by good taste and tentative care, not to say calculating caution, maintains the advance he made last year. Eminently artistic is the "Fair Beauty and the Dark One" (291); the tall figure of Mrs. Fernley leaning against a tree (369) is marked by graceful pose, and the sketchy head of a little girl with freely flowing hair (450) might almost be taken for Reynolds. With this last may be ranked "Alice in Wonderland" (1407). Here Mr.

Sidley has enhanced by pleasing fancy the beauty which nature gave his little sitter. Indeed a fancy treatment of portraiture is now the vogue; a dark background with nothing in it is quite out of date, and the old expedient of a column and a curtain has been superseded by gardens and green fields, or by the book-shelves of libraries and the nick-nacks of boudoirs.

But though there are changes for the better even among the most popular styles of portrait-painting, still the majority of the heads displayed are almost as bad as bad can be. To begin in high places, let us point to "Knitting a Stocking" (189), by Sir Francis Grant, P.R.A.; also let the visitor admire a figure by the same artist, in veritable signboard style, "On Board the *Harlequin*" (529). The present polite President of the Academy is known to hold a poor opinion of critics, and therefore he may prefer to hear his praises sounded by an Archbishop. We may mention, however, that some of the artists present at the Academy dinner interpreted ironically the following words of the Archbishop of York when proposing a toast:—"It might well be that Sir Francis Grant, trusting to his past distinction, should devote himself at this time of day to the important institution he has under his charge, but he rather chooses to continue adorning these walls with works that prove his perception is not dim, and that his hand has not lost its firmness." "Adorning these walls" may after all be nothing more than a euphemistic version of the art of "house-painting." In that case the President might easily call to his aid a goodly company of efficient assistants. Take the following:—"The Right Hon. John Bright, M.P." (112), by Mr. L. Dickinson (this portrait, if not precisely decorative, is decidedly democratic); "The Earl of Macclesfield" (446), by the Hon. H. Graves (a worse portrait has not to our knowledge been painted for the last three hundred years); "The Archbishop of York," (618) by Mr. H. Weigall (look at this picture after reading the Archbishop's eulogy on the President, and interpret the one by the other); "Helen Bremer and Lion" (644), by Mr. Desanges (this composition hung at the ceiling has been too well served—outside the skylight was the place for it); "Mrs. Dixon Hartland and her daughter Roma" (56), by Herr Bauerle (also, notwithstanding the artist's distinguished *clientèle*, deservedly hung high). Again royalty has fallen a victim; nothing can be more intolerable in point of art than "The Crown Princess of Germany" (395), by Herr Angeli, formerly known in Vienna, but now dating from Berlin. Rather better, though waxy in flesh-painting and metamorphic in drawing of hands, is the not unpleasing portrait of "The Duchess of Edinburgh" (194), by Professor Gustav Richter of Berlin. A large showy composition by this clever artist, the "Building of the Pyramids," we had the pleasure of commanding some months ago in our review of the International Exhibition at Vienna. We have observed that Professor Richter's studio in Berlin has of late been fashionably attended, which may account for the artist's decline since last we met him in Continental picture-galleries.

How the great men of our times will be transmitted to posterity by contemporary portrait-painters is always a question of some moment for the men themselves as well as for us and for posterity. And how a high historic character may be painted down we have painful proof in Mr. Healey's head of M. Thiers (279). This American artist has, in a way peculiar to himself, managed to mar some of the most intellectual heads in Europe. M. Yvon, the favourite of the Second Empire, clothes with infallibility and the spirit of aggression the comely figure of Monsignor Capel (92). The picture takes no rank in point of art. Mr. Roden's reading of the head of "Father Newman" (143), though poor in colour, is more student-like. M. Lehmann had the advantage of good taste and intellectual insight when he painted the unobtrusive but persuasive portrait of Sir W. Ferguson (192). Mr. Holman Hunt with a vengeance brings down his latest and heaviest mannerism on the head of "Thomas Fairbairn, Esq." (660). This is a portrait repellent in its power and obnoxious by its obtrusive realism. When we had the pleasure of bestowing more than faint praise on "The Shadow of the Cross," we little thought that non-ideal modes of study would lead down to this naturalistic bathos. A head striking for its thoughtfulness is that of the artist, Mr. W. G. Herbert. The painter, Mr. Herbert, R.A., who happens to be the sitter's father, impresses upon the features, as might be expected, the austerity of his own style.

To Mr. Watts, R.A., has fallen a greater share of men of capacious brains and of intellectual countenances than to almost any other painter, but a fair chance is hardly given to an artist when great men come for a sitting after the prime of life. This in some measure may account for what is painful in the portraits of "The late John Stuart Mill" (246) and of "The Rev. James Martineau" (51). The face of the latter is known to light up under the influence of animated discourse with a mental fervour wholly absent from this canvas. Mr. Wells, R.A., though not quite so particular as Mr. Watts in the choice of good subjects, has been identified with several of the leading men of the day. Perhaps it was not a piece of good luck that Mr. Morley, M.P. (664), should have fallen to his lot; but Mr. Wells is seldom wrong in the reading of character; and here the member for Bristol stands full length before us in the vehement action of a stump orator. Lord Selborne (321) in the robes of Lord Chancellor, by the same artist, naturally bears himself with greater calmness and dignity. The solid style of Mr. Wells and the deep-toned harmonies of Mr. Watts as exemplified in the above-mentioned portraits are almost too well known to need comment. But the unfinching and thorough manner of Mr. Ouless, comparatively a newcomer among us, is not so familiar.

It is short of the truth to say that Lord Selborne (578), by this artist, does not suffer by comparison with the portrait of the same learned lord by Mr. Wells. Indeed some have gone so far as to place Mr. Ouless on a level with Mr. Millais. But comparisons are peculiarly odious when pointed at contemporary artists. It is sufficient to say that each of the four portrait-painters we have just mentioned is sufficiently strong and distinctive to stand on his individual merits.

THE DERBY.

IN a year remarkable for the accidents that have happened to many prominent Derby candidates, as well as for the generally indifferent character of the three-year-olds, a sound and honest, though far from first-class, horse has deservedly carried off the prize. It has been of late a common remark that anything might win the Derby this year; but never was a sweeping assertion so signally falsified. There was, in fact, only one in the race after Tattenham Corner was safely rounded, and an easier victory was never accomplished. That anything might get a place in the Derby would have been a much safer prediction, for a sheet would have covered the half-dozen horses immediately behind the winner, and favourites and outsiders finished abreast of one another as they always do when both favourites and outsiders are alike of moderate quality. As will easily be remembered, there was a singular dearth of first-class merit among the two-year-old colts last year, and, as ill luck would have it, the very three whose claims to distinction were highest became the victims of unforeseen casualties. Marsworth, Ecossais, and Couronne de Fer were undoubtedly the cream of the two-year-olds, and George Frederick, who on Wednesday achieved the easiest Derby victory that has been seen for many a year, was not within a stone of any one of them. The lamented death of Baron Rothschild caused the disqualification of Marsworth for all his engagements; Ecossais, whose legs were always suspicious, was brought out for the Two Thousand in a half-prepared condition, as if his trainer had been unable or afraid to expose him to the ordeal of really hard work; and Couronne de Fer was believed to have become a roarer, and was certainly sold out of the last stable in England which would part with its best representative, and by the last owner in England who would let a Derby winner slip through his fingers for such a bagatelle as two thousand five hundred pounds. Further to smooth the way for a fair second-class horse whose legs could stand hard ground, neither Newry, the winner of the Middle Park Plate, nor Spectator, second in the same race, nor Napoleon III., winner of the Champagne Stakes, was engaged in the Derby. Moreover, Feu d'Amour, superior to George Frederick on public form, did not make the improvement that was expected during the winter, and was ultimately prevented by an accident from coming to the post; Reverberation, who had so rapidly advanced in form as to be able to make a dead heat with the unconquered Miss Toto, and run the Two Thousand winner to a neck, had since been unable to resist the effects of the fearfully hard ground, and though he did put in an appearance last Wednesday, could hardly move in the preliminary canter; and, to complete the chapter of accidents, Atlantic, the winner of the Two Thousand, injured himself during his journey from Newmarket to Epsom quite sufficiently to make the marks of the injury plainly perceptible on the Derby day, and thereby, however superficial the mischief may have been, decidedly did not improve his chance.

It really seemed as if, what with disqualifications, breakdown, and other casualties, there would not only be no first-class horses left to do battle in the Derby, but very few of the second class either. Hence public attention was directed to a number of obscure candidates, whose names would otherwise never have been mentioned in connexion with a great race. Mr. Merry had five engaged in the Derby, and it was hardly possible that not one of the five could stay a mile and a half in moderate company. So Daniel, Glenalmond, Rob Roy, and Sir William Wallace were backed in turn, the public vainly endeavouring to anticipate the judgment of the stable as to which should be its trusted representative; and when at length it was discovered that Glenalmond was the selected one, the public rushed to support him with all the old fervour of allegiance to the yellow jacket and black cap, although his solitary victory over Lemnos at Goodwood was the only public performance on which the hopes of his success could be founded. Glenalmond actually started first favourite for the Derby; and probably no horse, possessing such slender credentials, ever occupied a similar position. Then it was remembered that Tipster, a son of Adventurer, had beaten Atlantic last year at York; and that fact was quite enough to make people ask why he should not beat him again this year. Leolinus, whose name was hardly known to racing men before he was second in the Chester Cup, was also deemed worthy of support in the present emergency, probably because he had actually succeeded in galloping two miles and a half with some credit to himself and without breaking down. Even such indifferent performers as Trent, Rostrevor, and First Lord found friends, the answer to all inquiries as to the grounds for the confidence reposed in them being that, as there was not a really good horse in the race, anything that could gallop must have a chance. For the same reason probably Ecossais was never finally deserted. Despite his wretched forelegs, and his obvious want of condition a month ago, the recollec-

tion of his brilliant speed could not be effaced; and people flattered themselves with the idea that, if he could only safely get down the hill and into the straight, he would have little difficulty in shaking off the rubbish opposed to him. So, also, Couronne de Fer was rapidly brought back into favour when his distinguished two-year-old performances were recalled. Indeed, at the beginning of this week he was first favourite; but, despite the undisguised confidence of his friends, the established axiom that no roarer can win the Derby could not fail to influence the judgment of backers in the end, and both Glenalmond and Aquilo passed him in the quotations. Oddly enough, George Frederick, who had at any rate the recommendation of being perfectly sound in wind and limb and of having always run creditably, if not brilliantly, rather lost ground than gained it as the day of the race drew near. The fact is, that he is not a particularly taking horse to the eye. He is a somewhat clumsy-looking animal, with a heavy shoulder, and peacocky neck. He has always looked big also, and he looked big on Wednesday, though certainly less so than at Newmarket a month ago. Very few encomiums, however, were passed upon him, and had the start been delayed half an hour longer, it is probable that the offers against him would have been considerably enlarged.

The rain that fell on Wednesday morning, though not sufficient to affect the course, materially increased the comfort of the visitors to Epsom, who, by the way, were fewer in number than we ever remember to have seen. The Derby day is no longer the great annual holiday for Londoners, nor are Epsom Downs the only place where they can conveniently enjoy—or imagine they enjoy—a day's racing. Londoners have many holidays now, and all sorts of metropolitan race meetings are arranged for their amusement. They have developed of late years a decided preference for hurdle-races and steeplechases, and we think that they are beginning to find Epsom a delusion. They certainly stop away from it more and more every year; and on last Wednesday—a picked Derby day as far as the weather was concerned—the diminished attendance was everywhere perceptible, at the railway stations, on the road up the hill, in the paddock, in the neighbourhood of the Grand Stand, and even in the Grand Stand itself. Not only were the visitors fewer in number, but they were also as unenthusiastic as can well be imagined. The *lèvee* in the paddock was the dullest affair we ever witnessed. People seemed really ashamed of the shabby-looking lot of horses paraded before them, and that the great race of the year should be so unworthily contested. There was some compassion for a fallen favourite like Ecossais, some curiosity to see Couronne de Fer, whom one of the cleverest trainers in England had been content to dismiss from his stable, and some faint amusement at the appearance of two such remarkable candidates for Derby honours as Sir Arthur and Belford, who, according to current reports, were going to start to settle a bet as to which would come in last. But there was no enthusiasm, little partisanship, and but little expression of pronounced opinion as to the issue of the contest. Doubt took the place of confidence, and indifference of excitement. Perhaps the horse most liked was Leolinus—certainly he was preferred to either of his stable companions, Atlantic and Aquilo; and he is a well-shaped, lengthy horse, with good legs, and presenting the general appearance of a stayer. Trent was voted a handsome and Whitehall an improved horse. Couronne de Fer, though not much grown, was wiry and well trained, full of muscle, and with four excellent legs. Atlantic and Aquilo were both in splendid condition, and the first-named seemed none the worse for his accident, although, as we have said, its marks were plainly perceptible. Glenalmond was also in magnificent condition, but his small size created some astonishment. He has hardly grown since last year, and gives one the idea of being more fitted to a half-mile than a mile and a half course. Ecossais had evidently done some work since the Two Thousand week, but he looked as if his preparation had been hurried—which no doubt was the case—and a glance at his forelegs was in no way reassuring as to the chance of his descending the hill to Tattenham Corner in safety. Lastly, George Frederick, as we have said, failed to please. He made more enemies than friends in the paddock; and being evidently susceptible of considerably greater improvement, it was held that he would tire for want of condition in the last half-mile. Not a few resolved to reserve their support of him till the autumn, when they were of opinion he would be fully wound up; and they will still be able to carry their intention into effect, though perhaps on less advantageous terms.

The dull and spiritless inspection in the paddock having terminated, the parade and canter past the Grand Stand followed, and was got through with great celerity. Again were Leolinus and Trent most liked, the lengthy stride of the former attracting especial attention; while Lord Falmouth's pair, Couronne de Fer, and Ecossais, all went well, and Glenalmond seemed full of fire, though of a fire that was likely to burn itself out before more than half the distance had been traversed. Reverberation could not raise a gallop, and ought not to have been sent to the post, and some of the other competitors seemed quite out of their element. The twenty-eight more than last year, though with hardly one among them as good as Kaiser or Gang Forward—got to the starting-post in good time, and had the decency not to give the starter much trouble. The least that such a sorry lot of horses could do was to get off and have done with the race as speedily as possible and then vanish, most of them, out of sight of men; and thus much, we are willing to admit, they did accomplish to perfection. At the very first real attempt—there was just one opportunity before a fly-

ing start which in other days would have been taken advantage of—the flag fell; but so indifferent were the public that the customary shout announcing that the race has commenced was hardly audible. The story of the race is simply this, that Volturno made the running for George Frederick, who kept leisurely in the rear, up to Tattenham Corner, and that, when that wretched turn had been safely negotiated, George Frederick took up the running for himself, had all his opponents safe in a moment, and won in a common canter by two lengths, which might have been six if it had been desired. We never saw the Derby so decisively won at such a distance from the finish. At a quarter of a mile from the judge's box nineteen horses out of the twenty might have been pulled up; so utterly hopeless was their chance, so assured, beyond the possibility of doubt, was George Frederick's victory. The contest for second and third places was, however, as close as the winner's triumph was decisive. Here Jack proved himself as good as his master, and favourites and outsiders were associated in a strange medley. Atlantic and Aquilo, their stable companion Leolinus, and their former stable companions Couronne de Fer, Rostrevor, Trent, and the Vertumnus filly, finished all together, Couronne de Fer just securing the second money from Atlantic, who thus verified another Turf maxim that the winner of the Two Thousand is almost sure to get a place in the Derby, and the other five being so close up that it was hardly possible to separate them. It must have been a great mortification to Matthew Dawson to see all his horses beaten by their former companion, and it is clear that he must have taken an unduly unfavourable view of Couronne de Fer's condition. Not that his performance is much to boast of, for, when seven horses can hardly be whipped apart, while an eighth is walking away from them at his leisure, the legitimate inference is that the seven are all moderate. For, easily as George Frederick won, he has yet to prove himself a first-class horse, and he is not now by any means at his best. What then must be the quality of those horses who could not make even a show of a race with him on last Wednesday? In regard to the favourite, Glenalmond, we may observe that he never showed prominently at any part of the race. He seemed to us to run very awkwardly; but we learn that he met with a mishap of some kind in the early part of the race which sufficiently accounts for his ignominious display. However much he may improve on this form, we do not think that he will ever turn out a stayer. Ecossais got safely down the hill and looked as well as anything else till George Frederick came out and assumed the lead. In the last quarter of a mile he dropped further and further behind, and it is clear that he will never show to advantage except over a six-furlong course, where his fine speed may still serve him. As George Frederick may be expected to make considerable improvement between this and September, it cannot be reasonably anticipated that any of the nineteen horses behind him in the Derby will have much chance of turning the tables on him.

REVIEWS.

CARNE'S POLITICAL ECONOMY.*

IT is with great pleasure that we welcome another contribution to Political Economy from the ablest living representative of the school of Ricardo and Mill. Mr. Cairnes in his present work aims at restating and modifying some of the doctrines which have hitherto passed muster as established principles. He brings to the task a remarkable power of sustained and accurate thought upon topics which are apt to bewilder an ordinary brain; and a capacity for lucid expression which is hardly less rare and admirable. Mr. Cairnes, indeed, is so much at his ease amidst the complex phenomena presented by modern commerce, he takes such obvious delight in working out corollaries hitherto unnoticed, he has such difficulty in tearing himself away from speculations which are of theoretical interest, though too refined to be of much practical utility, that the task of the critic is rather unpleasantly onerous. We should never differ from Mr. Cairnes on economical questions without suspecting the accuracy of our own logic, for every proposition which he puts forward has evidently been considered carefully by a trained and acute thinker. In such cases a critic criticizes himself as well as his author. We are happy, indeed, to find ourselves so far in substantial agreement with Mr. Cairnes that we shall have little occasion for misgivings of this nature; and if we expressed disagreement we should intend to suggest grounds for an arrest of judgment rather than for reversing the decision. Mr. Cairnes, indeed, does not, like some recent writers, countenance any economical heresies. On the most important point discussed in the present volume he rather endeavours to re-establish the orthodox doctrine which had suffered from the lapse into heterodoxy of one of its most distinguished exponents. Mr. Cairnes has consistently defended the claims of Political Economy to be considered as a science. Mr. Thornton, partly followed by Mr. Mill, proposed a change which, from this point of view, would be little less revolutionary than a proposal to give up the truth of the laws of motion in dynamical treatises. If Mr. Thornton's criticisms were well founded, the treatises of Ricardo and of Mr. Mill himself would be fundamentally erroneous. And, therefore, to accept those

criticisms would be to admit that the science still remained to be founded, if indeed a science were possible. Mr. Cairnes's criticisms of the established dogmas is of a different nature. He holds that oversights have been made and disturbing forces neglected; and that by making a fuller statement, the valuable truths already discovered may be preserved, and theory be made to accommodate itself more accurately to facts. We may illustrate the point by the analogy of the natural sciences. Writers on mechanics make a number of assumptions for the sake of simplicity which are not accurately verified. They talk, for example, of perfectly rigid and perfectly flexible materials, though such materials do not exist in nature. If the formulae derived from such hypotheses were applied to concrete cases they would of course be found wanting. As no machine is constructed with mathematical accuracy, nor of absolutely rigid materials, a microscopical examination would prove that the results given by theory were not precisely realized. Mr. Thornton, pointing to such discrepancies, would say that the theory must be radically erroneous. Mr. Cairnes, more logically as we think, points out that the theory requires to be supplemented by making the original assumptions correspond more accurately to the facts. Allow for friction or imperfect rigidity, and the doctrine will be fully verified. The hypotheses made by political economists differ far more widely from the facts of experience than those of mechanical philosophers, because the phenomena under consideration are far more complex. Economists, for example, generally assume the existence of unrestricted freedom of competition to explain many phenomena of prices and wages. As Mr. Cairnes very ably points out, this assumption is often very far indeed from representing the actual state of the case. He shows especially, in the case of wages, how the phenomena will be modified by the existence of what he calls "non-competing groups" of labourers. He thus arrives at formulae which are necessarily more complex than those given by previous writers; but which form a nearer approximation to an accurate account of various social changes. The old theory was not so much wrong as inadequate. The tendencies which it assumed really existed; but they were masked or counteracted by other forces. By such modifications, Political Economy can be brought nearer to the problems actually presented; and it is chiefly in this direction that we must look for its improvement, and for its becoming ultimately fitted to form part of a harmonious social science. Mr. Cairnes is therefore fully justified in expressing a belief that his book is not antagonistic, but rather supplementary, to the teachings of Adam Smith, Malthus, Ricardo, and Mill.

The work is divided into three parts, dealing respectively with the theories of value, of labour and capital, and of international value. We can give but a very inadequate account within our space of the problems with which he deals; and we must content ourselves with saying, in regard to the last chapter, that it contains an admirable investigation of the general doctrine of international trade, illustrated by some very instructive remarks upon the recent industrial development of the United States. We would fain hope that some of the Protectionists of that country would read and digest Mr. Cairnes's criticism; but we much fear that they require to be educated before they can appreciate his arguments, and to be rendered less selfish before they would admit that the arguments, however sound in themselves, should lead them to prefer national welfare to personal profit. On the other two parts of the book we must say a little more. Mr. Cairnes subjects the doctrine of Ricardo and Mill, that "cost of production" determines prices in the case of unrestricted competition, to a searching examination. Admitting that, in a certain sense, the theory is not only true but of great importance, he thinks that it requires to be at once restated and modified. Besides supplying some valuable corrections, chiefly suggested by the absence in many cases of effective competition, Mr. Cairnes's mode of stating the case clears away many popular fallacies. Mr. Mill considers wages and profits to be the chief elements of "cost of production." Now, says Mr. Cairnes, it is illogical to identify wages with cost, for this is to identify the two ideas most radically opposed to each other—namely, the sacrifice which men incur in labouring and the reward of their sacrifice. The cause of the confusion is a simple one, which has contributed much to perplex other economical questions. It comes in fact from placing ourselves at the capitalist's point of view, instead of taking the more general ground of the interests of society at large. Wages form, of course, part of the cost to the capitalist who advances them; but it is a fallacy to treat them as part of the cost to the whole organization of which he forms a part. The vocabulary of commerce has of course been constructed from the capitalist's standpoint, and Political Economy has been compelled to draw its nomenclature from that vocabulary. The consequence is a constant confusion of ideas similar to that which would result in astronomy if we used the cosmical force of gravitation in the sense of a force which attracts bodies towards the centre of the earth. Mr. Cairnes, therefore, placing himself at the more general point of view, resolves the "cost of production" into the sacrifice of "labour," the sacrifice made by the capitalist in the form of "abstinence," and, finally, the sacrifice made in the shape of "risk." Thus stated, the theory expounded by Ricardo and Mill is not abrogated; for, by a happy inconsistency, they frequently used the term in the same sense; but it is cleared from many confusions, and made more coherent and comprehensive. We must confine ourselves to noticing one conclusion. Mr. Cairnes clears up with great perspicuity the confusion involved in the frequent assertion that a high rate of wages is an obstacle to foreign trade, inasmuch as it implies a high "cost of production."

* *Some Leading Principles of Political Economy newly Expounded.* By J. E. Cairnes. London: Macmillan & Co. 1874.

The doctrine frequently occurs in discussions upon American trade, and is used to justify a demand for protection. When we have once seized the true meaning of cost of production, the fallacy is easily unravelled. A high rate of wages means, in Mr. Cairnes's sense of the words, a low cost of production. In fact, as he says, "capitalists and labourers receive large remuneration in America because their industry produces largely"; and therefore the claim to protection of American industry, grounded upon the high "cost of production" (in the common sense) means "a demand for special legislative aid in consideration of the possession of special industrial facilities, a complaint, in short, against the exceptional bounty of nature." He goes on to show clearly that the alleged inability of Americans to compete with England in the manufacture of cutlery and calico means simply that they cannot compete with us "consistently with obtaining that rate of remuneration on their industry which is current in the United States." The inability proves that they possess advantages, not that they suffer from drawbacks. "It is as if a skilled artisan should complain that he could not compete with the hedger and ditcher. Let him only be content with the hedger and ditcher's rate of pay, and there will be nothing to prevent him from entering the lists even against this rival." The ambition of the Americans is, in fact, to compete not merely in those commodities in the production of which they have a great advantage, but in all commodities; and this pretension could only reach its legitimate end by destroying all international trade whatever. Though the fallacy may have been often pointed out in some degree, it has never been so decisively slain, and its root in the loose conception of what is meant by "cost of production" so clearly exhibited. If this were the only service rendered to Political Economy by Mr. Cairnes, he would deserve the praise of having probably added more than most living writers to the clearness of our conceptions.

We must add, however, that the second part, in which he attacks, and to our thinking disposes conclusively of, the fallacies of such writers as M. Longe and Mr. Thornton, some of which, as we have said, were sanctioned by Mr. Mill, is also of great value. We fear that even Mr. Cairnes will not be able to slay that most persistent and pestilent of all fallacies, which is implicitly admitted by Mr. Thornton and more expressly maintained by M. Longe, that a demand for commodities is a demand for labour. It is rather amusing to find that the *New York Tribune* reproduces the old sophistry in the old application. Mandeville said that the fire of London had done as much good as harm on account of the encouragement given to builders and carpenters; and the intelligent *Tribune* uses the same argument on the occasion of the fire of Chicago. Mr. Cairnes's new exposition of the "wage-fund" theory is in our opinion perfectly satisfactory, and dispenses the objections founded on an erroneous conception of its meaning. But, without following him upon this ground, we must venture a few remarks upon an argument which perhaps requires some elucidation. Mr. Cairnes discusses the great problem as to the cause of the increasing divergence between large and small properties. He argues, amongst other things, that an increased efficiency of labour will only affect the poor so far as it cheapens the commodities which they consume. If, he says, the production of some article consumed only by the rich be made easier, the only result will be that the value of the article will decline in proportion. A given capital will yield a larger return on this particular article; but as the value declines, the rates of the value produced to the value expended will remain undisturbed. This strikes us as an incomplete statement of the case. Admitting that the value of the supposed commodity will fall, it will yet follow that the total products of industry are increased and, so far, that there is a greater inducement to saving. If the efficiency of labour in regard to all articles of luxury were suddenly doubled, the result might be that the price of each article would be halved; and, in that sense, profits would be unaltered. But in that case every pound received by the capitalist would bring in twice as many luxuries. The immediate effect upon the labourer would be nothing; but, if we assume human nature to remain constant, an increased disposition on the part of the rich to save, and therefore an increase of the wage-fund, should be the result. The correction may be of small importance; and yet we seem otherwise to be led to the awkward conclusion that the desire to save is proportional not to the substantial reward, but to a certain arbitrary proportion between the values expended and received. If we ask why the rate of profit should prevail, the answer can only be given by saying that the sacrifice of abstinence is repaid by the enjoyment derived from the product. If, then, the product be suddenly increased, a lower rate of profit should be a sufficient inducement to the same amount of saving.

We do not attach much importance to this criticism, which would not in any case affect the general soundness of Mr. Cairnes's conclusions. On another point we feel more doubt. Seeing the difficulty of increasing the wage-fund, he finally decides that the only real hope of improving the labourer's position lies in co-operation. Mr. Cairnes, indeed, is fully sensible that the problem is not merely economical, and that the spread of co-operation could only be made possible by an increase of prudence and intelligence on the part of the labouring population. If this is granted, we do not see why improvement should not take place in other directions. Mr. Cairnes remarks, for example, that 120,000,000/- is annually spent on alcoholic drinks. If the working-man saved half of this he would throw 60,000,000/- a year upon the market, which, as Mr. Cairnes anticipates, would reduce the rate of interest to 1 or 2 per cent., a totally inadequate compensation for

the sacrifice of abstinence. Perhaps it would rather lead to an increased outflow of capital to countries in which the rate of profit is still higher, and is likely to be so for any period worth taking into account. He therefore argues that the labourers should combine and become capitalists themselves. Now, in the first place, it seems to us conceivable that the expenditure of 60,000,000/- withdrawn from the publicans and spent on rational objects might be sufficient to effect a very material improvement in the position of the labouring classes. The wages of all classes of labourers above the lowest would be sufficient to enable them to lead rational lives if only they had the necessary tastes and capacities; and the consequent improvement in self-restraint and prudence would prevent population from pressing as at present against the wage-fund. And, in the next place, the question whether they invest their savings in order to become themselves capitalists, employers of labour as well as labourers, or simply put them out to interest, seems to us to be of secondary importance. In one case they would have to oust a certain number of capitalists, and in the other they would, to a certain extent, discourage the savings of other classes by occupying the field for investment. If the capitalists found themselves beaten by the competition of Co-operative Societies, they would be disposed to lend their money rather than employ it in business, and the same effect would be produced on the rate of interest which Mr. Cairnes dreads from the other alternative. If workmen generally used their savings to buy their own houses, or to purchase annuities for their old age, we do not see why the effect should not be as good as if they became sharers in the risks and profits of commercial speculations. Mr. Cairnes states very truly the advantages of accumulated capital in increasing the efficiency of industry, and the same causes may be expected to promote the advantages of unity of administration. The question, however, is something of the largest, and we may be content to say that probably the result will not be so uniform as theorists are apt to assume. Co-operation has doubtless a great future, but we have yet to learn what are the limits to its applicability. We must, however, conclude by expressing our consciousness that we have done very scanty justice to a book which is full of luminous suggestions for the improvement of the theory of which it treats.

SWINBURNE'S BOTHWELL.*

M. SWINBURNE'S new poem has been looked for with some curiosity. His earlier writings, amid much that was rank and noisome, contained also much that was noble and beautiful. It was clear that he had the genuine poetic faculty, however insane and degraded might occasionally be his use of it; and there were many who looked hopefully to the future, trusting that time might purify as well as mature his muse. Seven or eight years have elapsed since then, and it cannot be said that Mr. Swinburne has during that period given his votaries much encouragement. Since the appearance of *Poems and Ballads* he has published only some stray snatches of verse, which seemed to indicate rather a decline than growth of power. He appeared indeed to be settling down into chronic hysterics, and to have grown content with sound at the expense of sense. When it was announced that he was engaged on an important work which was to cast his former trifling into the shade and to vindicate his genius, it was feared that perhaps the effort had been deferred too long. This work, however, has now appeared, and we may say at once that it seems to us fully to justify those who had confidence in Mr. Swinburne's capacity for higher things. There is nothing here to gratify the prurient or to alarm the prudish. If there is occasionally a plainness of speech which sounds a little strange, it is only an honest simplicity, and gives the flavour of the age to which the story belongs. *Bothwell*, in short, is not a mere repetition of *Chastelard*. It is altogether larger in conception and execution, and the atmosphere is pure.

Mr. Swinburne's most prejudiced critic cannot, we think, deny that *Bothwell* is a poem of a very high character. It is written in a broad, nervous style and moves with stately measure. Every line bears traces of power, individuality, and vivid imagination. There is much energy and passion in the book, but the reader will be agreeably surprised by Mr. Swinburne's new moderation and sobriety. The versification, while characteristically supple and melodious, also attains, in spite of some affectations, to a sustained strength and dignity of a remarkable kind. Mr. Swinburne is not only a master of the music of language, but he has that indescribable touch which discloses the true poet—the touch that lifts from off the ground. At the same time, with all these merits, *Bothwell* must be acknowledged to be rather a disappointing book. It is so good that it ought to have been much better, and it might easily have been made better. It is satisfactory to find that the poet has lifted himself out of the mire in which he previously dabbled, and that he is now devoting himself to work more worthy of his powers. Unfortunately, either from a too wanton self-confidence, or from a bluntness of artistic sense, he has contrived to make it difficult to do justice to the excellences of his poem. To be enjoyed, a poem must be read, and *Bothwell* is very hard reading. In the first place, there is a terrible deal of it. It is not everybody who, in these hasty days, has time to read through 532 pages of rather closely printed verse. And even those who have time and patience for the task must find themselves fagged and weary at the end of it. The mischief is not merely that it is a very long story. It is

* *Bothwell. A Tragedy.* By Algernon Charles Swinburne. London: Chatto & Windus. 1874.

that it is a story told in far too many words. It is not mere length, but unreasonable and unnecessary length, that we object to. The five acts of *Bothwell* are about equal to four or five plays of Shakespeare rolled together. There are single speeches in it which are as long as two or three of Shakespeare's scenes. Scarcely any of the characters design to open their mouths for less than a whole page or two of talking, and some of them have a way of running through half-a-dozen or a dozen pages without pausing for breath.

On the title-page the poem is called a tragedy, and the author, in his dedication to M. Victor Hugo, speaks of it as

Mon drame épique et plein de tumulte et de flamme.

It is needless of course to say that this does not imply that the work is intended for the stage. All that is meant is that it is a poem in a dramatic form. But there are fair limits to the length even of an epic, and there can be no question that Mr. Swinburne has transgressed them in this instance. The book is ruined by its exuberant and irrepressible diffuseness. It is sometimes said of a wood that it cannot be seen for the trees, and it may certainly be said here that the poem is hidden in the dense profusion of the words. Mr. Swinburne's muse is like an ill-regulated tap; though only a drop in a spoon is wanted, out blarts a deluge whenever the tap is turned. The victim of a too easy fluency, he apparently finds it easier to go on than to leave off; and his verse is really so round and full and flowing that sometimes we can hardly wonder at his infatuation. On the whole, however, Mr. Browning's closely-packed puzzles are far from being so fatiguing as Mr. Swinburne's overpowering wordiness. He might almost be supposed to have made a match with himself to wrap up everything he has to say in the greatest possible number of words. The wearying and depressing influence of this extravagant prolixity is intensified by deficiencies in perspective and dramatic variety. The characters all make too long speeches, and the speeches are too much in the same style. Lighting on a page at random, without the name of the character then speaking to guide you, it is sometimes difficult to know to whom the speech should be assigned. Mary Stuart at times has evidently modelled her style on Knox, or Knox has copied the Queen's. There are two dreams in the book, both of a shipwreck, one dreamt by Darnley, and the other by Bothwell, but the style in which each dream is told is the same. Mr. Swinburne has undoubtedly flashes of dramatic brightness; but he is deficient in sustained dramatic animation. His characters are too much talking-machines. They come in and make long statements of their feelings and general state of mind, and what they would like or would not like; but there is scarcely anything of the quick interchange of dramatic dialogue. In fact, it is rather monologue than dialogue, because, though there may be two people at once on the stage, they do not converse so much as follow each other in monologues. The same defect was observable in *Chastelard*, which was admirable as a subtle study of character, but weak as a dramatic representation. In such a story as Mr. Swinburne has chosen there is of course abundance of stirring incident, but the incident is almost all outside the play, and has little or no effect on the characters. The puppets have been dressed and trained beforehand, and remain to the end just what they were when first put upon the stage. The object of a drama should be to show how character is evolved or modified under the influence of incident.

Those who have read *Chastelard* will know the view which Mr. Swinburne takes of the character of Queen Mary, and to this he adheres, although abating the poisonous animalism which was a stain upon the former picture. Mary is still the same little, bright, inhuman creature, unscrupulous and remorseless in the indulgence of her passions, whether of love or hate, now threatening, now cajoling or betraying, and true only to the lust of the hour which she identifies with herself. By the side of Bothwell she assumes somewhat of a resemblance to Cleopatra, but she lacks the large and genial philosophy of Shakespeare's Egyptian, and Bothwell is but a clownish Antony. The character which Mr. Swinburne has endeavoured to portray is thus described by Knox:—

Her soul

Is as a flame of fire, insatiable,
And subtle as thin water; with her craft
Is passion mingled so inseparably
That each gets strength from other, her swift wit
By passion being enkindled and made hot,
And by her wit her keen and passionate heart
So tempered that it burn itself not out,
Consuming to no end.

Her fierce passionate nature craves perpetual variety and excitement. She is in love with Bothwell while still playing with Rizzio, and she chafes Bothwell with her jealous coquetry in a vain effort to strike new sparks of love out of the rough trooper. Her changeful moods are cleverly touched in one of her scenes with Rizzio. She has just been gloating with savage ferocity over the contemplated destruction of her half-brother Murray, and then she suddenly drops into a tone of simple innocence, and wishes she were some plain common woman "with no State to stay":—

QUEEN. God witness me, I had rather be re-born

And born a poor mean woman, and live low
With harmless habit and poor purity
Down to my dull death-day, a shepherd's wife,
Than a queen clothed and crowned with force and fear.

RIZZIO. Are you so weary of crowns, and would not be

Soon wearier waxen of sheepfolds?

QUEEN. 'Faith, who knows?

But I would not be weary, let that be

Part of my wish. I could be glad and good
Living so low, with little labours set
And little sleeps and watches, night and day
Falling and flowing as small waves in low sea
From shine to shadow and back, and out and in
Among the firths and reaches of low life:
I would I were away and well. No more,
For dearlove talk no more of policy.
Let France and faith and envy and England be,
And kingdom go and people; I had rather rest
Quiet for all my simple space of life,
With few friends' loves closing my life-days in
And few things known and grace of humble ways
A loving little life of sweet small works.
Good faith, I was not made for other life.

There is too much iteration in the picture of the Queen. Her bursts of rage, her curses of her enemies, her alternations of queenly dignity and womanly wile, her fondling of her brawny lover are repeated to weariness. The most tiresome parts of the poem are her love messages to Bothwell. There is perhaps more evidence of dramatic capacity in the delineation of Darnley than in that of any of the other characters. His weak, vain, swaggering nature, yet not without a touch of nobler qualities which might have ripened if Mary had not blighted them by her contempt and hatred, is skilfully touched. Rizzio is a mere shadow, and Bothwell scarcely more, and John Knox is only a grave figure in a black gown, who delivers eloquent denunciations of the Queen. One of Knox's speeches fills fourteen pages without break, and is undoubtedly very grand in its majestic intensity. We can only quote a fragment of it. Knox points to the fate which had befallen all who ever loved her—Hamilton, Gordon, then Chastelard, Rizzio, and Darnley:—

Of these

The slain and slayer, the spoiler and the spoilt
That each have lain down by her wedded side,
Which will ye say hath slept within her bed
A sleep more cursed, and from more evil dreams
Found a worse waking? he that with a blast
Which rent the loud night as a cry from hell
Was blown forth darkling from her sheets, or he
That shared and soiled them to this day wherein
God casts him out upon the track of Cain
To flee for ever with uncleansed red hands
And seek and find not where in the waste world
To hide the wicked writing on his brow
Till God rain death upon him?

* * * * *
Or if God haply give his lightnings charge
They hurt him not, and bid his wind pass by
And the stroke spare him of the bolted cloud,
Then seeing himself cast out of all that live
But not of death accepted, everywhere
An alien soul and shelterless from God,
He shall go mad with hate of his own soul,
Of God and man and life and death, and live
A loathlier life and deadlier than the worm's
That feeds on death, and when it rots from him
Curse God and die. Such end have these that loved;
And she that was beloved, what end shall she?

While there is throughout the poem much passion, there is a curious absence of the pathetic element. There is especially a hardness about Mary which is, to say the least, a mistake in art. After Rizzio is killed, she is full of pity for herself and rage against his murderers, but there is not a word of tenderness for the poor wretch himself. The only approach to pathos is in the very fine scene where Jane Gordon, Bothwell's divorced wife, takes leave of him and of the Queen. This hardness of tone, and want of tenderness and spiritual sympathy, are certainly serious blemishes. Indeed, it is continually forced on one that, skilful as Mr. Swinburne is within his range, it is a range with decided limitations, and that he fails to touch the noblest chords of human nature. The reader is left at last with a sense of something wanting. There are no lines that linger in the memory, no thoughts that open up the higher spheres of feeling and imagination. Mr. Swinburne is more at home in description than in dramatic evolution. Here, for example, is a vivid picture of the marriage of Mary and Bothwell:—

MELVILLE. I have not seen for any chance till now
So changed a woman in the face as she,
Saving with extreme sickness. She was wed
In her old mourning habits, and her face
As deadly as were they; the soft warm joy
That laughed in its fair feature, and put heart
In the eyes and gracious lips as to salute
All others' eyes with sweet regardfulness,
Looked as when winds have worn the white-rose leaf;
No fire between her eyelids, and no flower
In the April of her cheeks; their spring acold,
And but for want of very heart to weep
They had been rainier than they were forlorn.

HERRIES. And his new grace of Orkney?

MELVILLE. The good Duke
Was dumb while Adam Bothwell with grave lips
Set forth the scandal of his lewd life past
And fair faith of his present penitence,
Whose days to come being higher than his past place
Should expiate those gone by, and their good works
Atone those evil; hardly twitched his eye
Or twinkled half his thick lip's curve of hair,
Listening; but when the bishop made indeed
His large hard hand with her so flowerlike fast,
He seemed as 'twere for pride and mighty heart
To swell and shine with passion, and his eye
To take into the fire of its red look
All dangers and all adverse things that might
Rise out of days unrisen, to burn the up
With its great heat of triumph; and the hand

Fastening on hers so gript it that her lips
Trembled, and turned to catch the smile from his,
As though her spirit had put its own life off
And sense of joy or property of pain
To close with his alone; but this twin smile
Was briefer than a flash or gust that strikes
And is not; for the next word was not said
Ere her face waned again to winter-ward
As a moon smitten, and her answer came
As words from dead men wickedly wrung forth
By craft of wizards, forged and forceful breath
Which hangs on lips that loath it.

Interspersed through the tragedy are several songs, one in French, which show that Mr. Swinburne has lost none of his delicacy and finish in such compositions.

On the whole, while we welcome the reappearance of Mr. Swinburne clothed and in his right mind, and gladly recognize the masculine vigour and robustness of his present work, we are sorry that he should have been led by an overflow of words to make the reading of it so wearisome. What it needs is rigorous compression—not merely the excision of particular scenes, but condensation throughout. It would then be a powerful and vivid poem, which could be read with pleasure, though in any case it would remain deficient in some of the very highest qualities of poetry.

MOTLEY'S LIFE OF BARNEVELD.*

(Second Notice.)

THE trial and death of Barneveld, besides its interest as a tale and its importance as a piece of general European history, has a further importance as a piece of constitutional study, to which Mr. Motley, as an American writer and diplomatist, could not fail to be alive. Setting aside his actual innocence of anything which the law of any time or place would call a crime, Barneveld died for what an American would call the principle of State-right as opposed to the absorption of the powers of the separate Cantons of a Federal body into the hands of a central power. Barneveld was Advocate of Holland, one of the highest offices in the chief province of the Confederation. He was tried and put to death by judges appointed by the States-General, the highest Federal authority, but which, like every central power in a Confederation of independent States, can only have such powers as the confederated States have chosen to entrust to it. The principle is exactly the same, whether the powers entrusted to the central body are greater or smaller. The Swiss Constitution which has just been voted gives greater power to the Federal body than the Constitution of 1848, just as the Constitution of 1848 gave the Federal body greater power than the Pact of 1815. The powers granted in 1815 were about as small as they could be, if the Federal power was to have any authority at all; the powers granted in 1874 are about as large as they can be if the Cantons are to keep any independent being at all. But in either case the Cantons, as sovereign States, keep whatever powers they do not formally give up, and they keep them, not by grant or by sufferance, but of right. The Federal body, be its powers great or small, can neither increase nor lessen them of its own act; they can be increased or lessened only by the process, whatever it may be, which the sovereign Cantons have agreed upon as the means for making amendments in the terms of their union. Now the union of the Seven United Provinces was of the very laxest kind; it gave the States-General no powers whatever within the several provinces. It answered to the Swiss Pact of 1815, or perhaps rather to the still laxer union of the old times, and to the first Articles of Union between the United States of America in 1777. But the far larger powers possessed by the present Federal bodies in America and Switzerland are held by exactly the same right as the smaller powers held by the Federal bodies which went before them. The Federal Assembly under the Constitution of 1874 has no right to take to itself any powers which are not granted to it in that instrument, any more than the old Diet had to take to itself any powers not granted to it in the Pact of 1815. In all these cases the sovereignty is divided between the several Cantons and the Federal body. Each has a range in which it is independent, and in which the other has no right to interfere with it. It matters not in what proportion the sovereignty may be divided; it matters not whether the range of the cantonal or of the Federal power be wider or narrower; the principle is that each of them is sovereign and independent in its own range, whatever that range may be. Barneveld was put to death by judges appointed by the States-General, but the States-General had no judicial powers; the acts for which Barneveld was condemned, granting that he had done them and granting that they were crimes, were acts for which he was responsible to the courts of Holland only. The States-General had no power to judge Barneveld in any case. When they took upon themselves to judge him, even if the trial had been as fair and the sentence as just as they were manifestly the contrary, the breach of the rights of the province of Holland would have been exactly the same. The present Federal bodies both of America and Switzerland have judicial powers; but they can of course be exercised only within the range which the Constitution marks out. If the Federal Courts were to take upon themselves to judge any matter which the Constitution has not assigned to them, they would be guilty of the same breach of State-right of which the States-General

were guilty when they took upon themselves to name judges for the trials of Barneveld and Grotius. It is necessary to make these remarks in order to clear the way for what we have to say on some of the comments which Mr. Motley makes in some parts of his story.

The republic of the United Provinces, as Mr. Motley several times strongly insists, arose, like most successful republics, not out of any set purpose, but out of the circumstances of its history. The provinces of the Netherlands were members of the Empire, which came one by one, by various processes, under a single immediate sovereign, that sovereign being one of the great princes of Europe who grew into one still greater, a Duke of Burgundy who grew into a King of Spain and the Indies. Union under a great monarchy, a monarchy practically far more powerful than the Empire, naturally weakened the connexion with the Imperial overlord far more thoroughly than it was weakened in the case of countries whose princes were Princes of the Empire, and nothing else. The provinces were not formally separated from the Empire till the Peace of Westphalia; they were practically separated from it when they were first united under the Burgundian Dukes. Add to this that two of the southern provinces, Flanders and Artois, were, up to the Treaty of Madrid, fiefs, not of the Empire, but of the Crown of France. The one tie among the seventeen provinces was the common sovereign, a sovereign who was not King over the whole country, but Duke, Count, or Lord of this or that district separately. Within the provinces again the cities had the largest possible degree of municipal independence, though their form of government, like those of so many other cities, showed the usual tendency to grow up into narrow oligarchies. Thus, when certain of the provinces successfully threw off the yoke of the actual sovereign, and unsuccessfully tried to find some other sovereign to take his place, they drifted into a republican form of government through sheer necessity. But, when the one common tie was broken, they became, not one republic, but as many republics as there were provinces, one might almost say as many republics as there were cities. The state of things came about which Mr. Motley thus describes:—

The sovereignty of the country so far as its nature could be satisfactorily analysed seemed to be scattered through, and inherent in each one of, the multitudinous boards of magistracy—close corporations, self-elected—by which every city was governed. Nothing could be more preposterous. Practically, however, these boards were represented by deputies in each of the seven provincial assemblies, and these again sent councillors from among their number to the general assembly which was that of their High Mightinesses the Lords States-General.

The Province of Holland, being richer and more powerful than all its six sisters combined, was not unwilling to impose a supremacy which on the whole was practically conceded by the rest. Thus the Union of Utrecht established in 1579 was maintained for want of anything better as the foundation of the Commonwealth.

He adds a note which we do not fully understand:—

Such a constitution, rudimentary and almost chaotic, would have been impossible on a large territorial scale. Nothing but the exiguity of the domain prevented its polity from falling into incapacity instead of manifesting that extraordinary vigour which astonished the world. The secret of its force lay in the democratic principle, the sentiment of national independence and popular freedom of movement which underlay these petty municipal sovereignties. They were indeed so numerous that, while claiming to be oligarchies, they made up a kind of irregular democracy. Had such a constitution been copied instead of avoided by the fathers of our own republic the consequences would have probably been disastrous. Disintegration of the commonwealth at an early day, and possibly the birth of a hundred rival states, with different religions, laws, and even languages—such might have been the phenomena exhibited on what is now the soil of the United States.

“Exiguity” is, one would hope, a word of Mr. Motley’s own coinage; as far as we can venture a guess at its meaning, it means that the territory of the Confederation of the United Provinces was not so big as the territory of the other Confederation which stretches from the Atlantic to the Pacific. But surely the fathers of that Confederation neither copied nor avoided the Constitution of the United Provinces, but, like them, drifted into a state of things which their circumstances made in some points like, and in other points unlike, the state of things in the provinces. In the United States there was nothing like the practical supremacy of Holland, nothing like the municipal oligarchies, nothing like the position of the princely Stadholder. It was most likely the absence of these things which enabled the United States to take in 1789 the step which Switzerland took in 1848, but which the United Provinces never took, that of changing from a lax *Staatenbund* into an organized and thoroughly republican *Bundesstaat*. The points of likeness and unlikeness in the history of the two Confederations form therefore a most instructive piece of constitutional study; but it does not strike us that Mr. Motley has set about it in the most philosophical spirit. We do not know whether he has had any dealings with Mr. Lowe, but he certainly seems to have got somewhat of that contempt for “exiguity” which is at once fatal to historical and political study. He tells us at the beginning of his eleventh chapter that “this work aims at being a political study,” and he goes on to say:—

It may also be not uninteresting to venture a glance into the internal structure and workings of a republican and federal system of government, then for the first time reproduced almost spontaneously upon an extended scale.

Perhaps the revelation of some of its defects in spite of the faculty and vitality struggling against them, may not be without value for our own country and epoch. The system of Switzerland was too limited and homely, that of Venice too purely oligarchical, to have much moral for us now, or to render a study of their pathological phenomena especially instructive. The lessons taught us by the history of the Netherland confederacy may have more permanent meaning.

* *The Life and Death of John of Barneveld, Advocate of Holland, with a view of the Primary Causes and Movements of the Thirty Years War.* By John Lothrop Motley, D.C.L., LL.D. 2 vols. London: Murray. 1874.

Not long before, in the last chapter but one of the first volume, when saying that the Ministers of the Confederation in foreign countries were allowed the rank of Ambassadors, he adds:—

And this was at a moment when, with exception of the brave but insignificant cantons of Switzerland, the Republic had long been an obsolete idea.

We are sorry to see Mr. Motley falling into the wretched French jargon about "the Republic," "the Revolution," and the like. Nor can we understand what he means by saying that the Republic was an obsolete idea, when, as he presently remembers, there was still Venice, when there were also Genoa and Lucca and Ragusa, to say nothing of the Free Cities of Germany. Perhaps, however, most of these were guilty of the unpardonable sin of "exiguity." Nor do we quite see the good of such strange metaphors as the "pathological phenomena" of a Commonwealth. Nor do we know what is meant by the system of Switzerland being "too limited and homely." The United States themselves are not unlimited, and we do not know that homeliness is a fault. Nor can we understand why the political history of Switzerland, which goes on still, should not be as instructive as that of the Netherlands, which, in its republican and Federal form, has come to an end. Our notions of an instructive study of the various forms of Federal government carry us over a wider range both in time and space than Mr. Motley's. We must begin earlier, and we must on our own continent go on later. Mr. Motley has most likely shut his eyes to what is really the most remarkable political event of the present year, on account of the "exiguity" of the land in which it has been done.

The position of the several States of the United Provinces towards the States-General could hardly be better put than it was put by Barneveld speaking through the mouth of the States of Utrecht. In Mr. Motley's analysis it stands thus:—

They reminded the general government that by the 1st article of the "Closer Union" of Utrecht, on which that Assembly was founded, it was bound to support the States of the respective provinces and strengthen them with counsel, treasure, and blood if their respective rights, more especially their individual sovereignty, the most precious of all, should be assailed. To refrain from so doing would be to violate a solemn contract. They further reminded the council of state that by its institution the States-Provincial had not abdicated their respective sovereignties, but had reserved it in all matters not specifically mentioned in the original instruction by which it was created.

And again, in a letter to the French Ambassador Du Maurier, and in another to Caron, the Ambassador of the Provinces in England, he puts forth the state of the case in the clearest manner:—

"If the King were better informed," said Barneveld, "of our system and laws, we should have better hope than now. But one supposes through notorious error in foreign countries that the sovereignty stands with the States-General, which is not the case, except in things which by the Articles of Closer Union have been made common to all the provinces, while in other matters, as religion, justice, and polity, the sovereignty remains with each province, which foreigners seem unable to comprehend."

The complaint of Barneveld was that Englishmen could not understand that the separate States were sovereign commonwealths; they could not understand the doctrine of divided sovereignty which Barneveld so clearly put forth. Mr. Motley complains that, when the late civil war broke out in the United States, Englishmen were equally unable to understand the nature of a Confederation; they fell into the opposite error from their forefathers in the time of James the First, the error of believing that the States of the American Union were sovereign and independent. We must give the passage in full, though it is rather long:—

The States in arms against the general government on the other side of the Atlantic were strangely but not disingenuously assumed to be sovereign and independent, and many statesmen and a leading portion of the public justified them in their attempt to shake off the central government as if it were but a board of agency established by treaty among sovereigns and terminable at pleasure of any one of them.

Yet even a superficial glance at the written constitution of the Republic showed that its main object was to convert what had been a confederacy into an incorporation; and that the very essence of its renewed political existence was an organic law laid down by a whole people in their primitive capacity in place of a league banding together a group of independent little corporations. The chief attributes of sovereignty—the rights of war and peace, of coinage, of holding armies and navies, of issuing bills of credit, of foreign relations, of regulating and taxing foreign commerce—having been taken from the separate States by the united people thereof and bestowed upon a government provided with a single executive head, with a supreme tribunal, with a popular house of representatives and a senate, and with power to deal directly with the life and property of every individual in the land, it was strange indeed that the feudal, and in America utterly unmeaning, word Sovereign should have been thought an appropriate term for the different States which had fused themselves three-quarters of a century before into a Union.

It is really strange that an American statesman should fail to catch the doctrine of divided sovereignty so clearly put forth by Barneveld. Nor can we understand why the word sovereignty should in America be "utterly unmeaning." It is constantly used in political discussions in Switzerland, and we do not see what other there is to put in its place. What Mr. Motley has got in his head, what he is really fighting against, is not the doctrine of the sovereignty and independence of the States, but the further doctrine that the sovereignty and independence of the States imply their right to secede from the Confederation. But this last doctrine is by no means implied in the other. If it is to be made out, it must be made out by other arguments. The sovereignty and independence of the States, as set forth by Barneveld, and as every student of American or Swiss politics must understand it, means what we set forth at the be-

ginning of this article. It means that, while the central power of the Confederation has its own range within which the States may not meddle with it, and is therefore sovereign within that range, the States also have their range within which the central power may not meddle with them, and within which they also are sovereign. This is the difference between a State or Canton of a Confederation and a county or province or department of an ordinary kingdom or commonwealth. An Act of Parliament can do exactly what it pleases with everything in Yorkshire or in Rutland. An Act of Congress cannot do exactly what it pleases with everything in New York or Rhode Island. It can only regulate those things which the Federal Constitution gives it power to regulate. Mr. Motley shows with great truth that the range of the Federal power in the United States at present is far wider than the range of the Federal power was in the United Provinces in the days of Barneveld; but that fact in no way touches the sovereignty and independence of the States within the range, great or small, which either system tends to. Barneveld says that religion, justice, and polity were matters which were left to the States. The whole quarrel mainly arose out of an attempt on the part of the States-General to enforce one way of thinking in religion on the whole country. What would Mr. Motley think if the President and Congress were to attempt to legislate on religious matters—to set up, for instance, an Established Church throughout the Union or in any particular State? He would surely feel that the President and Congress had encroached, that they had violated a right of some kind. The right which they would violate by so doing would be that sovereignty and independence of the particular States which he denies. On this point the state of things in the United States now seems to be exactly the same as the state of things in the United Provinces in the days of Barneveld. In the matter of religion¹ the sovereignty of the several States is still untouched and undivided. In the matter of justice the case is different. The Federal power in the United Provinces had no judiciary; the Federal power in the United States has a judiciary. That is, in the matter of justice the sovereignty is divided. The sovereignty of the Union hinders the States from meddling with matters which belong to the courts of the Union. But the sovereignty of the States equally hinders the Union from meddling with matters which belong to the courts of the States. Mr. Motley would hardly like to see the judicial system of his own State reconstructed by the authority of the President or of Congress; that is, he would not like to see a violation of that sovereignty or independence of the States the existence of which he denies. Lastly, as to polity, the fact that the Constitutions of all the American States have converged so nearly to one model has put out of sight the liberty which the Federal Constitution leaves to them in this matter, and the actual amount of difference which there was between the Constitutions of different States during the earlier days of the Confederation. No State can make any branch of its Government hereditary; that is about the only limit. But it may be at pleasure a pure democracy such as Rhode Island once was, or a State with a strong oligarchic element, provided oligarchy does not take an hereditary form; and, though it may not set up an hereditary Prince, there is nothing to hinder it from setting up a Doge for life. As a matter of fact, the States have hit upon a form of Constitution different from any of these; but this has been done in the exercise of that sovereignty and independence which they might have exercised in choosing something quite different. What would Mr. Motley say to a change in the constitution of any State made by the authority of Congress? The thing to be got rid of is the notion, under which Mr. Motley clearly writes, that the doctrine of State sovereignty, as it was understood by Barneveld, as it is still understood in Switzerland, as it was lately understood in America, implies the right of secession. The two things have nothing to do with one another. Those who maintain the right of secession must maintain it on some other ground than that of the sovereignty of the States. The sovereignty of the States simply means that there is a range within which they are responsible to no higher power, within which the Federal authority has no right to meddle with them, within which they act independently, not of grant or sufferance, but of right. That this range is much narrower in the case of an American State now than it was in the case of one of the United Provinces in the time of Barneveld makes no difference in the principle. If Mr. Motley simply dislikes the words sovereignty and independence, as used to express the difference between an American State and an English county, we do not care about the words. If Mr. Motley can give us other words, especially if they are Teutonic words, to express the idea, we will heartily thank him. Till he does so, we must use such words as we have got, as we know no others which will so well express the meaning.

AILEEN FERRERS.*

THE literary market is so overstocked with novels by ladies that a new authoress starts at a considerable disadvantage; and as there are no indications of previous publications in the title-page, we may presume that this is Miss Morley's first attempt. But she certainly has one claim to notice which is sufficient to make her first attempt deserving of much more than the usual amount of attention which such works command. It is wholly unlike the ordinary novel by a lady. Its grammar is faultless, its style is

* *Aileen Ferrers.* By Susan Morley. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1874.

pure, flowing, terse, and correct, there is not a line of fine writing from beginning to end, and there is a total absence of anything like moralizing or the introduction of pretty, ineffectual sermons. To the elaboration of the main subject of the story everything conduces from the outset to the close. There is a directness and simplicity about the book which few men could surpass; while in its refinement, in its tone of somewhat melancholy reserve, and in its perhaps excessive minuteness of detail, it betrays in every page the marks of feminine composition. Such descriptions of scenery as it contains are short and natural, and compressed within the severest limits of good taste. *Aileen Ferrers* is the story of a girl who, without any fault of her own, finds herself placed in a difficult and trying position; and her fortunes carry her alternately into high London society and into the life of humble people on the Northern moors. Evidently at home in both spheres, the author makes incidents and character fit easily into the framework she has designed for them, and has carefully studied the problem how such a girl as Aileen would feel and act under the varying circumstances of her lot. It is as a study of character worked out in a manner that is free from almost all the usual faults of lady writers that *Aileen Ferrers* merits a place apart from its innumerable rivals. But it would be almost impossible that a novel with such merits should not also have cognate defects. It is interesting rather than entertaining. The story never drags, and in one part of the book where the troubles of Aileen come to a climax the interest is great, and of a high order; but in those parts where the mere business of the story is going on the amusement of the reader is certainly not consulted. The description of London society is in its way accurate, but the author knows it, or one side of it, perhaps too well, and seems to have found it to be a very poor affair. The simplicity of the writing precludes the notion of anything like designed satire; but there is much of that undesigned satire which shows itself in a faithful sketch of a sphere of life where there is all that greatness and wealth can give, and where the good people are graceful, prudent, and well conducted, but where there is scarcely a trace of those few really great and sweet things which can alone repay a human being for the trouble of being born. Even in this wilderness of well-mannered mediocrity, however, the author sees that a flower belonging by nature to a different region may by accident spring up and flourish; and she has devoted herself with much care, skill, and success to creating and perfecting such a flower in the original and very attractive character of the heroine.

It is not a book the interest of which is in the least diminished by the plot being known beforehand. There is no complication of which the reader is stimulated to guess the secret, no surprise that is to give the key to preceding mysteries. Perhaps it may even be said to be a book which gains by its plot being known, as then the merits of execution become more obvious. The problem which the author has set before herself is this:—Aileen is the orphan daughter by a secret marriage of a brother of Lord Braithwaite. She is brought up by her grandmother, the wife of a bailiff living in a farmhouse on the moors, until she is sixteen, and on her sixteenth birthday consents to become the wife of a young gamekeeper. But the secret of her birth has just at this crisis become known to her dead father's family, and her aunt, Lady Grace, arrives to claim and adopt her. Aileen refuses to go unless it is understood that she is at liberty to return when she is twenty-one and marry Ralph if she pleases; and, this being settled, she is carried off by her aunt, who gives her an excellent education abroad and then introduces her into the great world of London. She does not find any new lover to her taste, she is naturally disgusted with the frivolity and selfishness of the men and the petty malignity of the women by whom she is surrounded, and, although warmly attached to her uncle Lord Braithwaite, to her aunt, and to Mr. Lushington, an old friend of her father, she is quite in the mood, when her twenty-first birthday arrives, to go back to her old Northern home and fulfil her engagement with the excellent and simple-hearted Ralph, although she is a fine lady and he is a gamekeeper. She is quite ready to bind herself at once; but she has promised her aunt that before coming to a final decision she will let a month go by in order that she may have time to ascertain the real nature of her feelings. During this month she slowly awakens to the painful consciousness that a marriage with a man so much her inferior in cultivation would be a fatal mistake. She struggles hard not to seem wanting in generosity and to convince herself that she must not trifle with the happiness of her humble but devoted lover. At last she takes the plunge, tells Ralph that it cannot be, and leaves her moorland home for ever in the charge of Lord Braithwaite. She has been greatly fortified in her resolve by the companionship of Mr. Lushington, who has been injured by an accident while on a shooting party on the moors and has been carried to the farm where Aileen is staying. His society, the friendly talk they have together, the books she reads to him and with him, awaken the conviction that she can never again go back to the days of her untutored girlhood, and that a life from which all she has learnt to know and value is excluded must be one of sheer and simple misery. After she leaves Ralph and is once more free she soon begins to feel that the society of her old friend has become indispensable to her, and the story rapidly concludes with her engagement to Mr. Lushington. The month of doubt, affection, remorse, and hardening resolution that she passes at the moors is the centre of the interest of the tale, and it is here that the author shows what she can really do when at her best. But there are many of the minor parts of the story which exhibit fertility of invention and a sense of the value at-

taching to unity of design. The description of London society, which in itself is rather flat and perhaps disproportionately long, is so managed that almost every part of it bears more or less directly on the conduct and character of Aileen during the one important and interesting month of her life; and as heroines must be married, and, if a novel is drawing to its close, must be married quickly, considerable praise is due to the arrangement which confides Aileen to the sober sense and mature pleasantness of Mr. Lushington. Miss Morley has too just a perception of what will be in harmony with the reader's feelings to let Aileen, immediately after she has gone through the painful crisis of her broken engagement with Ralph, succumb to the rapture of a young love or the brilliancy of a great match.

In order to estimate how the author has dealt with the difficulties which her subject presented to her as she approached its climax, it is necessary to remember what these difficulties were. Aileen is a young lady and Ralph is a gamekeeper, and it is not by any means an easy thing to sit down and write a story so that the engagement of a young lady to a gamekeeper shall be natural, probable, and interesting. Mr. Trollope has lately, in *Lady Anna*, treated a somewhat similar subject; but his tailor is one of those fiery spirits who belong to no particular rank, and Lady Anna is the worse educated of the two, and, except that she becomes Lady Anna and rich, has no advantage over him; and then what Mr. Trollope sets himself to do is to show how, in spite of being Lady Anna and rich, she is to be excused for marrying her ardent tailor. Miss Morley has imposed on herself quite a different task. She has attempted to realize the feelings of a girl accustomed to high and refined society and keenly alive to intellectual and social pleasures, and yet with a totally different side to her nature—an openness to the great things of life, a lively sympathy with homely things and people, a generosity that trembles to give pain, a rebelliousness against conventional standards, and a just estimate of the value of the honest love she has awakened. To do this was difficult, but Miss Morley has done it, and it is because she has done it that her novel rises to a level far above that which cultivated women with a facile pen ordinarily attain when they set themselves to write a story. But she has not been able, or has not ventured, to paint the other side of the picture. The young lady engaged to the gamekeeper is depicted, but not the gamekeeper engaged to the young lady. It would have required genius of a very high order to make a man in such a position at once natural and true to life, and yet with such unusual elevation of character that the reader would find it probable that a girl like Aileen would be for a long time ready to give up everything for him. No one living, perhaps, but the writer who drew Adam Bede could have successfully encountered the enormous difficulties of the task; but Miss Morley is an author who ought never to be content unless she aims, with however imperfect success, at the great things in her art; and she has exercised the discretion of a too timid prudence in confining within the narrow bounds of safety her portraiture of Ralph. By endowing him with high moral qualities and the tact with which unselfish regard for a woman inspires men in every station, Miss Morley avoids the danger of making it seem impossible that Aileen should have had a sharp struggle of feeling as to how she was finally to decide. But he is only described, not made alive, and he comes across the thread of Aileen's life more as a source of embarrassment and mental conflict than as a lover able to bring the influence of manly passion to affect the will of a woman who thinks herself not only bound but ready to marry him. Aileen is thus left alone in the story. The society in which she moves in London exists to educate her by what it has of good, and to alienate her by what it has of bad. Ralph exists to get her into a difficulty, and Basil Lushington exists to get her out of it. This concentration of all the interest of a story on the heroine is a familiar feature in the novels of ladies. Women feel that, however limited may be their knowledge of other things, they are on sure ground when they touch on the passions, the sorrows, the hopes, and the fears of a woman. It is true that Miss Morley does not write as most ladies write. She makes her incidents converge to one main end; she has by mere fidelity of observation and simplicity of writing given to the several parts of her story a likeness to real life; her men are not like the men ordinarily met with in ladies' novels, mere barber's blocks trimmed with a few feminine virtues. But still art is art, and Miss Morley has obviously a sense denied to most authoresses that novel-writing is an art; and art demands that fiction, which, to be great, must be always in some shape or other a mirror of life, should be a mirror of something more than the emotions of a girl of twenty. Miss Morley, who has done so much, could surely do more than she has done.

Her story, however, as she has written it, has to be judged by her conception and elaboration of the character of Aileen; and to see Aileen at her best, she must be seen in her moorland home during her month of suspense and trial. She is welcomed by her grandmother, who nevertheless lets her see that she thinks that a girl like Aileen coming back to a man like Ralph and to the simple ways of her old home must be a mere whim which will soon pass away. Aileen, however, thinks very differently. She is thoroughly in earnest, she wishes to forget her London life, and honestly believes that the new life she has chosen is the one really suited to her. The day after her arrival she goes out with a zealous determination to make herself useful, and her feelings at the outset of her country life are described in the following charming passage:—

After dinner Mrs. Dymock and Aileen also went to the hay-field, and worked there for an hour or two. Somehow the day of real country life, the

cheerful, useful employments, the scent of the hay, the hum of talk among the haymakers, and the unceasing accompaniment kept up by the little river which ran at the foot of the meadow, acted upon Aileen's imagination and made her feel that this was her right place in the world. Here she should find healthy occupation, a round of pleasant, useful, definite duties, affection and peace, and rest from all the vexed questions constantly arising in society and from such exhausting mental conflicts as she had been enduring lately. She was in a sort of dream, in which she seemed to find it easy to make up her mind. The fear of future regret passed away for the moment, and she felt pleasure in the prospect of the sort of life she imagined herself leading. There was a charm even in its monotony.

Aileen soon meets Ralph, but with very little of the eagerness a girl ought to feel in meeting a lover. It almost pains her to see how totally his sentiments are unchanged. The exigencies of the story demand that, unconsciously to herself, she shall never have been in love with him. She is bound to him because he loves her, because he is so good, because she is under a promise to him. But she has never lost her heart, and if she had lost it even for a moment, the story must have come to an abrupt end. As, however, she fully intends to marry him, she behaves to him as if their engagement was a recognized fact, and she walks and talks with him on as easy a footing as she finds possible, and listens to him while he at once expresses his gratitude and love, and gives vent to his doubts whether after all he is destined to be happy. But at the end of a fortnight she begins to be wretched. She realizes that he is not meant for her, nor she for him. "She felt that in truth she dreaded Ralph's constant companionship. She had condemned herself to mental solitude for life, and the prospect was dreary." She can get on with him, for her old knowledge of country life serves her with materials for conversation. But she acutely feels that there is no real sympathy between them. "She was conscious that she always talked to him and for him, never with him or for herself," a sentence which in its epigrammatic brevity conveys as much as might have filled half-a-dozen pages. She will not tolerate in herself any shrinking from what she believes to be the path of duty. She will never let him know the sacrifice she is making for him, while for herself she can best express her feelings by a passage which she recites from the *Spanish Gipsy*, to the effect, among other things, that "faithfulness can feed on suffering and knows no disappointment." She at once checks her thoughts, and reproaches herself for giving way to "melodramatic nonsense"; but the reader is made alive to the absurdity of a girl whose feelings find expression in passages from the *Spanish Gipsy* being condemned to spend every hour of the day and night with a gamekeeper. Then comes the scene when Basil Lushington is on the moors, meets Aileen, hears of her intended marriage with indignation, pity, and alarm, and finally encounters the lucky accident which lays him up with Aileen to nurse him, until she sees that she cannot endure the pain of living with an uncultivated man, and the equally great pain of not living with a cultivated one. She knows now what she must tell Ralph, but she feels intense shame and poignant regret at having to tell anything so painful. Her self-reproach is perhaps excessive, but she would have been worth very little if, under such circumstances, it had not been excessive. As we have said before, we could wish that a writer like Miss Morley had seen her way to do something more than analyse and describe the emotions of a girl. But if the emotions of a girl in Aileen's position are to be analysed and described, it is hard to see how the thing could have been better done than Miss Morley has done it:—

The time had come at last when there could be no more hesitation. The final decision must now be made, and Aileen could not doubt what it must be. She knew that the sacrifice which she must make in keeping her engagement was one greater than she was capable of making in the way in which alone it would be of any avail. She felt that Basil had spoken truly when he told her that the sacrifice would be worse than useless, only an unjustifiable cruelty, unless it were carried out by consistent self-suppression for the rest of her life. She seemed to herself very poor-hearted, mean, and despicably weak; but she acknowledged her weakness, and admitted to herself that, being what she was, she must not take upon her a burden which it had not been given to her to bear. She must submit to the humiliation of accepting the sacrifice of Ralph's happiness, because she was so weak that she must avow herself to be incapable of sacrificing her own.

She saw that she must decide it thus, but it caused her acute shame and pain to do so. It was horrible to her to think of Ralph's having to endure such suffering at her hands, and she felt that it ought not to have been so impossible to her to keep her faith when the time came; that it could not have been so had she not carelessly allowed herself to forget the tie by which she was bound, and to live another life filled with different interests and sympathies.

Had she kept before her a vivid recollection of Ralph, and of the love she had promised him, all would have been easy now; but she had failed miserably in truth and constancy; she had yielded weakly to each temptation as it came to her, and when at last she had tried to recall the feelings of the past and to keep her promise, she could not do it. She had been selfish, weak, and faithless—all that in another she would have most bitterly condemned—and unfortunately the punishment could not be borne by her alone.

She nerves herself to the effort. She tells Ralph, and all is over. The story, or at least all that is really interesting in the story, is done. Sorrowful, and the cause of sorrow, Aileen retires from her gamekeeper and her old home to a lot really to her taste. All that can be said to mitigate her regret and soften her self-accusings is expressed by the old bailiff whose house she is quitting, when he tells her—"There's a deal of suffering got to be done in this world, Aileen, and some has one sort and some another; but where there's been no wrong done by anybody, folks get over it far quicker."

BELL'S BRITISH QUADRUPEDS.*

IT is five-and-thirty years since the original publication of Bell's *British Quadrupeds*, as one volume of the series of works on the zoology of these islands prepared by a number of eminent naturalists for a firm of enterprising publishers. There is much ground for satisfaction in learning that so meritorious an undertaking has met with the success that befitted it, the series of treatises generally having taken the place of standard works upon each several department of nature, and the demand having encouraged the publishers to issue further editions. So much has been added in the interval to what was known of our native animals that Mr. Bell has found it incumbent upon him to revise throughout and in no inconsiderable measure to re-write his original treatise. We may congratulate a veteran naturalist upon having crowned with his mature observation and study the edifice of a life's earnest and patient labour. Certain modifications in the plan and structure of the work, as well as manifold additions and corrections in detail, have been the result of this revision. The chapters upon our domestic animals, including the horse, dog, cat, and other familiar denizens of the farm or pets of the household, have been omitted altogether, partly because these species are not to be properly regarded as members of our fauna, partly because no adequate or satisfactory account could be given of them within such narrow limits. The reasonableness of this plea will be apparent on looking back to the meagre treatment which subjects of such wide and varied interest received in the first edition. The process of domestication alone serves to introduce an element into the enumeration or differentiation of species or varieties which admits or calls for boundless discussion in the face of recent views of evolution within the animal pale. Nor has it been so much Mr. Bell's aim to open up problems of biology, or even of development in specific forms, as to ascertain and enunciate clearly the facts which characterize the nature and the habits of every group or type of animals within his scope. The domestic series apart, sixty-seven species of British Mammals—which, the Cetaceans being included, we should have thought a fitter title for Mr. Bell's book than that of *British Quadrupeds*—were treated of in the first edition. Of these seven have now been rejected; *Vespertilio marginatus*, though a well-marked species common to France and Belgium, never having been recognized in the British Islands, *Phoca barbata* having been wrongly identified, *Vespertilio pygmaeus*, obviously the young of the Pipistrelle, *Plecotus brevimanus*, now universally regarded as the young of *Plecotus auritus*, and *Sorex remifer*, *Lepus Hibernicus* and *Phryetor tursio*, not being certainly distinct species. On the other hand, thirteen species have been added to the list, of which only one, *Sorex pygmaeus*, is a land animal, two are seals, *Phoca hispida* and *Cystophora cristata*, and the rest cetaceans. Thus the entire mammalian fauna of the British Islands, as accepted in the work before us, comprises seventy-three species, belonging to the following orders:—

Cheiroptera	14 species.
Insectivora	5 "
Carnivora	15 "
Rodentia	13 "
Ruminantia	4 "
Cetacea	22 "

The claims of three of these species are, however, held to be somewhat doubtful by our author, on grounds into which he goes in detail when discussing them under their respective heads. These are *Vespertilio murinus*, *Phoca grandis*, and *Balaena mysticetus*.

The woodcuts illustrative of each typical animal, drawn with admirable clearness, delicacy, and truth, are in the main the same as those of the first edition. Amongst those newly included in the list we may notice the razor-back whale, (*Balaenoptera musculus*, Linn.) or common Rorqual, copied from the figure inserted and described by Professor Flower in the Proceedings of the Zoological Society for 1869, as well as Sibbald's Rorqual (*B. Sibbaldi*, Gray), probably the largest of its family, taken from Professor Turner's paper upon this species, and the curious *Ziphius cavirostris* (Cuvier), first captured off the British coast in 1870, and identified with Cuvier's whale by the same able naturalist, who has thus made an important addition to the list of British cetaceans. Mr. Bell has given no comparative table showing at a glance the distribution of the affinities or the manifold species under which the various orders and genera of our mammalia present themselves. All we get is a mere general index, the systematic names being printed for distinction in italics. Although it may be sufficiently convenient for reference, such a catalogue forms but an inadequate guide or introduction for the student, who has to wade through each description in detail for the characteristics on which each specific difference is seen to turn. It is true that the restriction of the author's design to the British fauna exclusively would of necessity have the effect of presenting any such scheme or system of classification in somewhat of a mutilated shape, for the want of those foreign congeners who in the plan of nature have their place and rank in the family tree. But when so respectable a show is made by the groups or species that make these islands their home, each several order might at least have been exhibited in some sort as an organic whole, rather than in the simple catalogue which is all we now have to refer to. In the

* *A History of British Quadrupeds, including the Cetaceans*. By Thomas Bell, F.R.S., F.L.S., F.Z.S., F.G.S., &c. Second Edition, revised and partly re-written by the Author, assisted by Robert F. Tomes and Edward Richard Alston, F.Z.S. Illustrated by 160 Woodcuts. London: J. Van Voorst. 1874.

case of the bats, the first order in Mr. Bell's series, restricted as he explains it to be by the necessary dismemberment of the large group formerly comprehended under this term, the genus *Vesperilio* still retains a variety of representatives, which, with one species of *Plecotus*, one of *Barbastellus*, and two of *Rhinolophus*, make in all fourteen species, all belonging to the insectivorous division of the order. The opinion expressed in the former edition of the work, that many other species of bat would be found indigenous to this country, is no longer to be entertained. As regards their general structure and habits, which are made the subject of the author's introductory remarks, the more recent studies of Professor Blasius, Kuhl, and other naturalists are incorporated with the facts which we owe to the patient and accurate observations of White and Jenyns. The system of division by means of the specific characters of the ears and tragus, coupled with those of the dentition (first made use of by him in the discrimination of the species of this genus), is supplemented by differences of the head and the wing membranes, which materially assist towards discriminating some of the more easily confounded British species. The same division of the simple-nosed species having been adopted by Count Keyserling and Blasius, the generic name *Vesperugo* was given by them to the group having the rounded ear and broad tragus, *Vesperus* being proposed as a sub-generic name for the group represented by the Serotine bat. But, as it has been shown that Dr. Leach long ago applied to one of these groups the name of *Scotophilus*, his typical specimen preserved in the British Museum proving to be either a young Serotine or other allied form, it is clear that the name of *Scotophilus* should be substituted for *Vesperugo*. Of this group the Noctule, or great bat (*Scotophilus noctula*), first discriminated by Daubenton, and named *Altivolans* by White, who first noted it as a British species at Selborne, where it still abounds, is one of the most marked, the largest in Britain next to *V. murinus*. Though never found here north of Yorkshire, it is described as widely distributed in Europe, reaching Scandinavia and parts of Russia. Specimens have been sent hither from North Africa, Mozambique, and Japan, and Mr. Bell is convinced of its identity with *Scotophilus labiatus*, from Nepaul. While admitting its local disappearance, he is silent as to the migratory character of this bat accounting in part for this recurrence of similar species.

The singular error, countenanced as it has been by men as great as Aristotle and Pliny, of classing the bat with birds, only to be paralleled by the senseless prejudice or antipathy which has beset these harmless and interesting creatures, has been corrected by the common sense of the less learned. "Flutter-mouse," or the still older and probably obsolete "rermouse," expresses our forefathers' feeling of the true affinity of the hand-winged family. Much confusion at the same time hung over the synonyms of our common bat, until Mr. Jenyns made it clear that the common bat of Britain is the *Pipistrelle* of Continental writers. Because *Vesperilio murinus* was their common bat—their "chauve-souris" par excellence—it was presumed even by Pennant that our common bat must be the same species, albeit *V. murinus* is really one of the rarest amongst us. Mr. Bell's minute and careful description will enable anybody to discriminate it from *V. nattereri*, *V. myotacinus*, *Plecotus auritus*, *Barbastellus*, or other species which are often taken in company with it, and exhibit a generic resemblance. Minute as it is, in fact the least in size of British species, Dr. Schinz has, we learn, thought himself to have found a smaller bat, which he has described under the name of *V. minutissimus*. Mr. Bell has no doubt whatever of this being the young of the *Pipistrelle*, or common bat, like *V. pygmaeus*, of which he gives an illustration. A handsome and striking species, known as Bechstein's bat, is among the rarest in this country, having been taken only in the New Forest, but it is readily correlated with Continental specimens. It is far from sociable, haunting hollow trees exclusively. Its ears are exceptionally large, and its wings, though broad, comparatively short. For length of ears no animal comes near *Plecotus auritus*, these highly-developed organs being as long as the body itself. It was upon the long-eared bat that the experiments of M. Jurine were made as to the flight of bats when deprived of sight. No lessening of their power to keep clear, in their most rapid flight, of objects the most intricate or minute, such as the furniture or cords stretched across the room, was observed until their organs of hearing were also closed. This is a common, though not very abundant, species in Britain, readily tamed and even playful. Its voice and walk are peculiar. The *Plecotus brevimanus* of Jenyns, of which a figure was given in the first edition, is now recognized by our author as simply a young long-eared bat.

In his original work Mr. Bell conformed to the prevailing opinion that the Arvicolas constituted an aberrant group of the beavers, instead of being placed with the mice, the patronymic name of Arvicolidae giving way in consequence to that of Castoridae. It is to Mr. Waterhouse that he assigns the credit of having corrected this mistake, by reference to the osteological characters on which rather than on mere points of superficial resemblance the classification of this difficult order of mammals is to be determined. Speaking of the genera *Ondatra*, *Arvicola*, and *Lemmus*, represented respectively by the American musk-wash, the voles, and the lemmings, that able naturalist describes these groups as having all the essential characters of the Muridae, differing mainly in having rootless molars, and in the form of the lower jaw as well as in the structure of the cranium. Not only is this affinity made clear by the instance of an American rodent, the genus *Neotoma*, but in a truly British rodent, the bank vole, or red field vole (*Arvicola glareolus*,

Schreber), is seen a passage from the voles to the true rats. The dentition and other characteristic marks of this species, together with those of the remaining two which haunt our river banks and meadows, the water vole or rat (*A. amphibius*, Desmar.) and common field vole (*A. agrestis*, Linn.) are minutely detailed by Mr. Bell. The five cemental spaces in the second upper molar of *A. agrestis* sufficiently show it to be distinct from its Continental congener *A. arvalis*, which, like all the other European voles, has but four. It is remarked by Mr. Bell as strange that, whilst *A. arvalis*, so common throughout central Europe, has never yet been met with in Great Britain, its teeth have been found in a semi-fossil condition in fissures in the limestone rocks near Bath. The drift formations of Wilts and Somerset have also yielded remains of species now extinct in Britain, including the Alpine *A. nivalis* and the northern *A. rattiiceps*.

To find not only the seal and walrus, but the whale, classed among British mammals might take an unthinking reader by surprise. Considering, however, the wide range of latitude over which the British group of islands extends, it need no longer be thought strange that the list includes many forms of animal life whose proper home is the Arctic seas. The only question is where to draw the line of identification. Not only do the Orkneys and Hebrides afford shelter and breeding ground to species of Phocidae, which Mr. Bell sets down as eleven in number after all deductions; but the walrus, the single representative of its genus (*Trichecus*) to be regarded as a true seal under the sub-order *Pinnipedia*, with the Phocidae and Otaridae (eared seals), is found as an occasional straggler to our northern coasts, though not so frequently as of yore. Of the Cetacea, with which Mr. Bell closes his list, including with the right or Greenland, the Atlantic, sperm, and other whales, the porpoise and the dolphin, our waters yield specimens enough to call for much discrimination on the part of the naturalist who has to lay down their points of specific difference. The way in which these finely divided species have been classified, the homologies of the bony structure determined, and the specific marks of character and function in each made clear, forms not the least valuable portion of the work for which we have to thank Mr. Bell and his coadjutors.

COOKS AND COOKERY.*

CULINARY literature can hardly be said to be at a standstill in England when we have before us contemporary contributions to it from artists, professors, and directors at Buckingham Palace, the Crystal Palace, and the South Kensington School of Cookery. While the Gouffés in the "Royal Pastry Book," as also in the "Livre de Cuisine," prescribe for aristocratic appetites with exquisite delicacy and elaborate art, Mrs. Mary Hooper, on the other hand, bids for clients amidst the rather undefinable grade which limits its number of dinner-guests to five or six, and professes to give small *menu* for small parties, small incomes, and small establishments. Of the three perhaps Lady Barker is the most cosmopolitan, as she is certainly the most amusing; and in literary cooking at least she has proved herself an adept, a considerable part of her little book being, as a contemporary has pointed out, a hash or *réchauffé* of Dr. Lankester's well-known work on food. Lady Barker pleads for less waste, without worse living, in the upper circles, and looks to the National School of Cookery (with or without reason, as the result will show) to develop culinary education so that it may spread downwards from the well-to-do classes to the cottage of the labouring-man, whose food is "monotonous and unwholesome as much from lack of invention as from shallowness of purse." Readers may or may not take in the little doses of borrowed chemistry with which she gives a dash of profundity to her usually lively pages, but we suspect that they will find themselves more at home with her for guide than with the illustrious *chef* of the Paris Jockey Club on the one hand, or the fair professor of domestic economy at the Crystal Palace School of Art on the other. As Horace says, "Est inter Tanaim quiddam socerumque Viselli"; and—we almost say it with awe—there is a wide gulf, which even Lady Barker does not adequately fill, between the pupil of Carême, whose introduction to pastry-making was at the preparation for the great ball given by the city of Paris to the Duke of Angoulême in 1823, at which 7,000 guests sat down to supper, and the ultra-economic lady who, in suggesting little dinners for little people, almost rushes into the Scylla of shabbiness in her desire to steer clear of the Charybdis of "Cookery-Book quarts of cream and dozens of eggs and oysters."

The ordinary meat and pudding dinner may doubtless involve too much solid meat; but the English stomach, unless we are mistaken, will shudder at the little *menu* in which chicken-giblet soup, chicken-giblet pie, or stewed chicken giblets, are recommended as an important feature, because "in large towns the giblets of fowls are to be bought at a very moderate price at the poultier's." In most country kitchens their utmost use would be to serve for stock and dressing for the chicken to which they appertain, and we must say that if we are invited to one of Mrs. Hooper's "little dinners" we shall pray that it may have been found convenient (for it appears this is not *de rigueur*) to

* *The Royal Pastry and Confectionary Book.* By Jules Gouffé. Translated by Alphonse Gouffé, Head Pastrycook to the Queen. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1874.

Little Dinners; how to Serve them with Elegance and Economy. By Mary Hooper. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1874.

First Lessons in the Principles of Cooking. By Lady Barker. Macmillan & Co. 1874.

serve a few forcemeat balls in the stewed chicken giblets, as it is not clear that, without these, there would be aught in the dish for the teeth to lay hold upon. Indeed, as has been already hinted, our doubt about these "little dinners" is as to what precise rank or household they are suitable. Certainly the average cook of a middle-class household of the period would "thank heaven she was respectable" and announce her intention of leaving that day month, if bidden to go to the butcher and purchase, as materials for soup, the calves'-tails which Mrs. Hooper in the same breath pronounces delicious and admits to be usually left by the butcher as the perquisite of the skin-collector. A notable housewife, with a grandmotherly culinary instinct, and a knack of turning out nice little dinners with no other help save that of a maid-of-all-work, might conceivably produce a delicious novelty in soups out of cast-away calves'-tails; but even then she would be unwise to publish the nature of this novelty on her *menu*. Mrs. Hooper has so much faith in these caudal resources that she advises the utilizing the meat and vegetables of such soup for a baked pie with a mashed potato crust. It might be great fun to partake of a little dinner of this sort, such as Traddles and the dear girls might surprise David Copperfield withal; but, for better or worse, we take it that the English husband would sooner endure the unimaginative house-keeping which rings the changes on mutton-chops, pork-chops, lamb-chops, and beefsteaks, than knowingly acquiesce in a double debt to such delicacies as Mrs. Hooper would wrest from the hitherto monopolist skin-collectors. The roasted hare in p. 34 might be the basis of a very good dinner, but we may be excused for indulging one lingering thought upon the bacon which is used to cover the back in basting. Mrs. Hooper, in her thrift, tells us that it will serve for making stuffing, or as an addition to rissoles, or is very good eaten cold. Elsewhere she rather dampens our critical appetite by the somewhat apologetic or make-believe nature of her "hors-d'oeuvres," and her advocacy of ox-hearts and sheep's-hearts as cheap dainties which may be used to great advantage in a pie, mince, rissolette, hash, pudding, or fry, if stewed. It is penny wise and pound foolish to task one's digestive powers for the sake of getting 5 lbs. of meat at 2s. 3d.; and it will take a good deal of stewing to make ox-heart digestible. But we ought not to omit the mention of several very good recipes which Mrs. Hooper vouchsafes us, e.g. rump-steak pudding (151), sheep's-head, Scotch fashion (161), devilled fowl (186), rich plum-pudding (222), neck of venison cooked in a V oven (p. 80), how to cook whitebait, and how to "scallop oysters." She has good hints about salmi of wild duck, and her caution on the deliberate preparation of the sauce for the same delicacy, roasted, assures us that—given the means and the heart to put her knowledge in practice—she undeniably knows what is good. Her instincts as to the service of the table, the linen, the glass, the flowers, the wines, the fruit, the facilities for "self-help," are all excellent; and she does not think it too much a matter of detail to recommend "Huile d'Aix" as the finest salad oil. It were well too if all cooks would lay to heart the rule she lays down that herrings, eels, &c., should be fried in plenty of fat, because the process draws out the fish-oil (which renders them disagreeable and indigestible), especially if the fish is set before the fire and drained before serving.

On some points it would be curious to compare the views of Mrs. Hooper, Lady Barker, and M. Gouffé; for though the last deals especially with pastry and confectionary in the volume now before us, yet he touches common ground with the other two in such items of what he oddly denominates his "indigenous pastry" chapter, as beefsteak pie, beefsteaks pudding, pigeon pie, mutton patties, and mince pies (see pp. 432-8). And here we discover a wonderful concord of ideas. Two of the three writers aim in one way or other at popularizing less hackneyed forms of cooking than the eternal roast and boil, and as soon as we come to stewing, broiling, and frying, we are reminded by both of that which Gouffé again and again lays down as the secret of success in all cooking. Disputing Brillat Savarin's aphorism, Gouffé holds that a man need not be born a roasting cook, for his whole art "consists in watching the clock; it is more a question of time-keeping than a natural gift." A little further on we shall show how largely in his view precision, eye to temperature, and exactness as to the different degrees of heat enter into the qualifications of a first-rate pastrycook, an artist in his eye of infinitely higher genius than a mere roaster. Mrs. Hooper attributes the failure of stews to "want of proper materials and of knowledge how to regulate the temperature so that the contents of the stewpan are kept just below boiling point—or at that stage known as simmering." Lady Barker ascribes the cause of hashed mutton being "a by-word of nastiness" to an ignorant cook's omitting to let the gravy and the meat warm gradually and thoroughly together, and suffering it to stew too long, and to become hard instead of soft. Her own recipe is simple enough, and yet methodically calculated even to the toast sippets; and we share her confidence that the result will be such as to stultify the oracular caution of the cockney millionaire who bade his family "never eat 'ashes away from 'ome." The process of frying is often as sadly mismanaged as stewing, but it is interesting to find Mrs. Hooper and Lady Barker quite at one upon the wholesomeness of things properly fried—that is, immersed in plenty of boiling fat, of a proper temperature (about 350° Fahr., according to Mrs. Hooper). There is need of a clear smokeless fire, and a clean frying-pan. But the chief point of all is that the fat should be actually boiling in which the frying process is to go on. "Here, again," writes Lady Barker, "we are met by prejudice, for ninety cooks out of a hundred

will allege that they are 'respectable women' when asked to use a frimometer or a thermometer, and prefer to ascertain the temperature of their fat by guesswork or by means of a sprig of parsley" (p. 81). It seems as if it were a great point of the female British cook's charter to resist every effort to coax her into calculation, method, and exactitude. The bad bakings in so many houses arise from the inveterate misrule of thumb in the kitchens, and from cooks "scorning to make the temperature of the oven a certainty by means of a thermometer," which "is the only trustworthy way of making sure of the oven, the water, or the fat" in baking, boiling, and frying. M. Gouffé also insists upon the importance of the temperature of the oven, and upon the different degrees of heat proper for various kinds of baking and paste-making, as of the very essence of successful pastry. He does not despise minute directions as to the heating of the oven, and propounds a series of tests of its proper temperature for various achievements in pastry. The heat for baking all small pastry which requires glazing by the oven is called "dark brown paper heat," because a sheet of white paper placed on the floor of the oven and shut in will be scorched to a dark brown colour, without igniting, when the oven is at its proper temperature for this purpose. The test of a nicely graduated lower temperature for baking "vol-au-vents," hot pie-crusts, &c., is called "light brown paper heat." "Dark yellow paper heat" denotes the temperature suitable for baking the larger pieces of pastry, and "light yellow paper heat" that required for baking "mangues, gnoises, meringues, and all small pastry which does not need glazing." "I cannot," writes M. Gouffé, "recommend too urgently great attention to the matter of oven-heating, and of accurate timing of the various bakings." In this nicety and accuracy, evinced not only here, but in the minute processes of boiling sugar to the blow, to the ball, to the soft ball, to the crack, and to the hard crack, in making spun sugar, puff paste (pp. 40-1), and in divers other matters, we see the real difference between a perfect and an imperfect cook. One might be disposed to smile at the enthusiastic Frenchman's faith in the primeval antiquity of his art, and at his demand of a rudimentary knowledge of drawing, sculpture, architecture, and a genius for imitating offhand any of nature's models, as indispensable qualifications for every young pastrycook. But there is a solid body of sound practical method in all that M. Gouffé writes, which shows that he has really built up his eminence in his craft by exact attention to niceties which the rank and file of his profession allow to go haphazard. It is a hopeful sign that, starting from an independent point, and occupying a different part of the culinary field, Mrs. Hooper and Lady Barker both set great store by the same rule of exactness in time, temperature, and measurements. Here we have the basis of all good cookery.

This we take to be the main lesson to be learnt from the three volumes which have furnished a text for the foregoing remarks. All are more or less excellent in their different ways. Gouffé is great in his large pieces of pastry, his croquenbouches, his meringues, his pear-tartlets in graduated stands, his triumphs of spun sugar; and we do not doubt that these would come out as splendidly on the supper-table as in the chromo-lithographs of Mr. E. Ronjat. Mrs. Hooper atones for the seeming stint of some of her recipes by the thorough goodness of others, and by the common sense which she brings to bear on the regeneration of the culinary art. Lady Barker's book deals with a vast variety of foods, from mutton to macaroni, and modes of preparing them, from enclosing poultry in a crust of dough and baking it gipsy-fashion to boiling potatoes or making omelettes. The wider the circulation of their several views, the more hope will there be of good dinners—big or little—in the future.

ADAMS'S HISTORY OF JAPAN.*

THE history of Japan since the conclusion of the foreign treaties, as related by Mr. Adams—and it is to this period that he devotes almost the whole of the volume before us, his title-page notwithstanding—consists of a succession of startling incidents and strange complications as are to be found in any pages of fiction. We have in the Shōgun a claimant to Imperial rank who has no right whatever to the title; we have murders, assassinations, and riots without end; we have a revolution overturning the ancient order of things; and we have an Empire in enjoyment of a feudal system such as was to be found in Europe during the middle ages, suddenly transformed into a brand-new State on the model of the most advanced nations of the West. To students of history this chapter in the world's records is of great interest, presenting as it does probably a unique instance of such instantaneous results arising out of the collision of two systems of civilization so widely different as those of Europe and Japan.

Like the monkish authors of old, Mr. Adams begins at the very beginning of things, and gives us at the outset a brief sketch of the Japanese account of the creation of the world and of man; he then traces the growth of the ancient institutions of the Empire, the divine descent of the Mikados, the division of classes, the rise of the Shōguns, the persecutions of the Christians, the establishment of the Tokugawa dynasty of Shōguns, and the long era of peace and prosperity which followed it. With these matters he fills about eighty pages, the remainder of the volume, over four hundred pages, being devoted to the history of the period from 1854 to

* *The History of Japan, from the Earliest Period to the Present Time.* Vol. I. To the year 1864. By Francis Ottewell Adams, F.R.G.S. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1874.

1864. Prior to the first-named date the only foreigners residing in Japan were a few Dutch merchants, who were confined to a small piece of ground at Nagasaki; and so little was known of the institutions of the country that, when Commodore Perry arrived to negotiate a treaty in 1853, he allowed himself to be persuaded into the belief that the Shōgun, literally General, was the temporal Emperor, and with him therefore he entered into an alliance. Unfortunately, without making any study of the matter, the Ambassadors of the other treaty Powers blindly followed his example, and thus laid the foundation of all the uneasiness, danger, and trouble which disturbed the foreign relations of Japan during the succeeding years.

The object of the Shōgun in palming himself off on the foreign envoys as the ruling sovereign was doubtless to shelve the question of the treaties, which was daily becoming more and more troublesome. He expected by treating in his own name to gain time, and at all events to leave a loophole by which the Mikado might, if he found it convenient to do so, escape from the consequences of his negotiations. But he entirely misunderstood the people with whom he was entering into a covenant, and overlooked the fact that by dealing with foreigners he was putting a dangerous weapon into the hands of his political enemies at home. For a long time there had existed great jealousy between the Shōgun and his advisers on the one hand, and the Daimios connected with the Court of the Mikado on the other. No sooner, therefore, was it known that the Shōgun had entered into an alliance with the hated foreigner than intrigues were set on foot against him by the officials at Kioto. He was denounced to the Mikado as a traitor to his country. His representations were disregarded, the Emperor's consent to the treaties was refused, and secret orders were issued to the Prince of Mito to expel the foreigners. It was at this juncture that Sir R. Alcock, together with other foreign representatives, arrived to take up his residence at Yokohama. This was the signal for the prosecution of more active measures on the part of the anti-foreign party, who desired not only to wreak their vengeance on the persons of the foreigners, but also by so doing to embroil in a foreign quarrel the Government of the Shōgun, or rather of the Regent, Ii Kamon no Kami, into whose hands, on the death of the Shōgun during the previous year, the management of affairs at Yedo had fallen. No time was lost in carrying out this scheme:—

In 1859, on the 25th of August, a Russian officer and two sailors were cut down and mutilated in the streets of Yokohama; and on the 6th of November, the French Consul's Chinese servant, dressed in European clothes, was also killed in that town. In 1860, on the 30th of January, Denkichi, Mr. Alcock's Japanese linguist (also in European clothes), was mortally wounded at the very gateway of the envoy's residence, and on the 26th of February, two Dutchmen, masters of merchant vessels, were hacked to pieces in the streets of Yokohama.

These attacks on the foreign communities were followed a month later by the murder of the Regent, who had shown himself well disposed towards foreigners, at the gate of the Shōgun's castle. On New Year's Day of the succeeding year the Ministers were officially informed that a band of five hundred *ronins*, literally "wave-men," had conspired to attack the different Legations and kill all the members thereof. Fortunately the danger, if any then existed, passed away for the time; but almost immediately afterwards Mr. Hensken, the Interpreter to the American Legation, was mortally wounded in the streets of Yedo, by a party of assassins, and a few months later a desperate night attack was made upon the British Legation, which was repulsed only by the promptitude and courage of Messrs. Oliphant, Morrison, and other members of the Mission. For not one of these murders and onslaughts was a single person brought to justice by the Yedo authorities, who, though anxious to do all in their power, appeared to be afraid of punishing natives for attacks on the persons and property of foreigners.

Great efforts were made at this time to fill up the breach between the Mikado and the Shōgun, and to this end a marriage was arranged to take place between the latter and the Emperor's sister. For this act of condescension it was plain that something would be expected in return, and the request which was directly preferred to the foreign representatives—to put off the opening of the Treaty ports—indicated the price the Shōgun was paying for the honour done to him. The matter was referred to the Foreign Office, and eventually a mission was despatched to London to urge the views of the Shōgun's Government on Lord Russell. Meanwhile a second night attack was made on the English Legation, which resulted in the death of two Marines and the suicide of the assailant. For this outrage the sum of 10,000*l.* was demanded and paid as compensation to the families of the two murdered men. The insolence of the war party was now approaching a climax, but the roll of their victims was not yet complete. A few months later as an English lady, Mrs. Borrodale, and three gentlemen, Messrs. Richardson, Marshall, and Clarke, were riding along the high road, they met a procession of several hundred Samurai escorting a Prince of the House of Satsuma on his way from the capital. The riders kept well to the near side, walking their horses, until they arrived at the main body, which was then occupying the whole of the road. Mrs. Borrodale and Mr. Richardson were riding about ten yards in advance, Mr. Richardson riding on the off side of that lady. When a few of the procession had passed a man stepped in front of them, and barred the way. Mr. Clarke exclaimed, "Don't go on; we can turn into a side road," and Mr. Marshall added, "For God's sake, let us have no row." The horses of the whole party were then quietly turned round, when, as Mr. Marshall states in his evidence on oath, "I saw a man in the centre of the procession throwing the upper part of his clothes off his shoulders, leaving himself

naked to the waist, and drawing his sword, which he swung with both hands, he rushed upon Richardson. I shouted 'Away!' but before our horses were started, Richardson was struck across the side, under the left arm. The same man rushed upon me, and struck me in the same place under the left arm.

Others of the escort then drew their swords, and both Mr. Clarke and his horse were wounded. Eventually, however, the riders outstripped their pursuers, but before they had gone far it was obvious that Richardson was mortally wounded. At length he dropped off his horse, apparently dead, and his companions, believing all further help would be of no avail, rode on to a place of safety. As the name of the Prince was well known, Colonel Neale, H.M.'s Charge d'Affaires, at once demanded that the murderers should be given up. This the Shōgun's Government declared itself powerless to effect, and Colonel Neale therefore called upon the British Admiral to send a fleet to the Satsuma territory to chastise the offending Daimio. After several delays the expedition arrived at Kagoshima, where they met with a most determined resistance. The fire of the English ships, however, was not to be withstood; the batteries were destroyed and part of the town was burned to the ground. The effect of this engagement on the vanquished was as instantaneous as it was salutary. They speedily "took the lead in introducing European machinery and inventions, and in employing skilled Europeans to teach them, and they became fired with a desire to rival foreign nations in the arts of civilization and peace as well as in the art of war." Another expedition undertaken later against the chief of the Chōshū clan was equally beneficial in its results, and thus two of the most powerful of the war party were gained over to our side.

Great exception was taken in Parliament to these warlike proceedings. But it may fairly be said that to them is to be attributed the present peaceful state of our relations with Japan, and it is to be hoped that the very important ends gained will impress the lesson to be learnt from them upon our Foreign Office. The difficulty we have had to contend with both in China and in Japan has been to impress upon the people the fact of our superior power. When once this has been accomplished, they have invariably shown themselves ready and willing to treat with us on friendly terms. The spirit of the challenge thrown down in the valley of Elah, "If ye be able to fight with us, then will ye be our servants, but if we prevail against you, then shall ye be our servants," has found an echo on the plains of China, and among the hills and streams of Japan. Let the people of either country thoroughly understand that we have the power to enforce our rights, and that we are ready to use it, and we shall hear no more of assassinations or of wholesale massacres.

We have thus briefly sketched some of the leading political events related in Mr. Adams's volume. As a diplomatic study, and as referring to a deeply interesting episode in contemporary history, it is well worth reading. The information it contains is trustworthy, and is carefully compiled, and the style is all that can be desired.

NO INTENTIONS.*

WE do not expect too much from fallible human nature, and we know that young collegians, whether the sons of earls or of soap-boilers, are apt to be less satisfactory than might be; sometimes silly, sometimes bad, and for the most part selfish and unreflecting after the manner of youth in general. But there are limits to the most philosophic acceptance of frailty and folly; and Mrs. Ross Church, in the character of her hero Eric Keir, as well as of some other personages in her present novel, has passed those limits by a long way. We know that all lads do not go through the *Sturm und Drang* period of life with the stoical indifference of Kenelm Chillingly; but we hope that many are not so criminally sensual as Eric Keir, and that the love which would be strong enough to induce a fine young gentleman, born in the purple, to marry a pretty if uneducated girl of the people, is not generally of that base kind which a three months' possession wears out. Nor do we think Mrs. Ross Church right in even the main lines of her psychology. An older man, experienced and *blasé*, might have got tired of a new mistress in that time; but a young man, fresh, and we may suppose moderately virtuous, who has not yet been brought face to face with any of the graver social consequences of his mistake, who has still the mysterious charm of secrecy to keep his romance alive, and who, it is to be presumed, had some kind of foresight, some amount of self-consciousness, when he took the serious step of marrying, would surely have retained a certain love for his beautiful wife, if only of the lowest kind. He could have married her for nothing but the lowest love; and its speedy cessation was not to his honour, and as little according to nature. Had there been the smallest admixture of real tenderness or manly purity to soften the more repulsive quality of his feelings, he would not have told her in three months' time that he should be "happy if he could wipe out the remembrance of the past with his blood"; that it "would be better if they were both dead, or had died before they saw each other." It was scarcely worth while to ride over from Oxford to Fetterley for the purpose of making his wife cry by saying disagreeable things to her, and of proving himself a cad, according to his own vocabulary, from head to heel. It seems to us that we have never met with a more thoroughly corrupt as well as weak-minded young man than this

* *No Intentions.* A Novel. By Florence Marryat (Mrs. Ross Church). Author of "Love's Conflict," &c. 3 vols. London: Richard Bentley & Son. 1874.

handsome, affectionate, agreeable, and accomplished Eric Keir, the second son of Lord Northam, and the husband of Myra Cray, the niece of a village laundress. Nor is Myra herself, by the by, to all appearance the stuff of which noblemen's sons make even clandestine wives.

Eric's interview with Myra has a curious ring of brutality through it; from his first greeting to her at the front door, when he rebukes her for flinging herself upon his neck, to his philosophic acceptance of the kisses which she "showers almost roughly on his mouth, his eyes, his brow"; from his lordly indifference to the "large, lustrous, dark eyes, and soft brown hair that flows and curls about her neck, and a pair of passionate red lips that are on a dangerous level with his own" to his "fraternal" adieu, when he says loftily, "It's a shame of me to have made those pretty eyes so red!" continuing with "Don't think twice of what I have said, Myra"—to wit, his shame and regret at having married her—"you urged me on to it with your cross-questioning, and you know I lament this business for both our sakes, but the dark mood will be gone to-morrow. It's nothing unusual after three months of honeymoon, my dear." As Mrs. Ross Church does not present Eric Keir to us as a scoundrel, but makes him her hero and surrounds him with the glory of the situation, we are bound to believe that she does not see his infamy as infamy, and that when she sighs out her aphorism, "Alas! for the love of one-and-twenty, when it begins to temper its love with philosophy," she imagines she has given cause and excuse in a breath, and that the subject demands no deeper discussion.

As a further illustration of the quality of this young "scion of a noble house," we may mention his line of conduct when Myra takes flight with her cousin Joel Cray, as she does that very night. She has promised to keep the marriage secret, and she loyally holds to her word. When her cousin, who is in love with her, taxes her with her shame, she shuts her lips on the word that would prove her virtuous, and lets him take her back to her native village disgraced, though she is really "Mr. Hamilton's" lawful wife and her child is his legitimate son. She acts with an heroic constancy and self-suppression entirely mythical; but Eric Keir, after a few perfunctory attempts to find her—"private inquiries, and carefully-worded newspaper advertisements," being the rather vague means employed—goes abroad for two years, flirts with all the pretty girls he comes near, but always with "no intentions," and finally gets entangled in a serious love affair with Irene St. John, whom he has neither the self-control to avoid nor the candour to enlighten. One word as to the reason why he cannot confess the love he makes and declare his "intentions" to be as honourable as they should be, would have prevented all the after complications, and have made the dark things clear. But then Mrs. Ross Church must have elaborated another plot and a finer kind of hero; which she might have found troublesome. Deception, coupled with the weakest self-indulgence, is the dominant characteristic of her present *jeune premier*; but we will do Mrs. Ross Church the justice of acknowledging that she is so far impartial that few of her people are a shade better than Eric in this particular. If they do not tell direct falsehoods, they never tell the truth in this somewhat less than high-toned novel; and no one thinks it necessary to let any one else have the satisfaction of knowing how things really are. Eric Keir conceals his marriage with Myra Cray from Irene, who is breaking her heart for him, while he is doing the same for her. Myra conceals her marriage with "Mr. 'Amilton," though to declare it would remove the stigma from her child as well as from herself, quiet her cousin Joel's solicitations, and give her a better chance of finding her lost spouse. Irene conceals from her husband that it was Eric Keir for whom she cried her eyes red and her cheeks pale; and her husband, Colonel Mordaunt, conceals from her that his *soi-disant* nephew, Oliver Ralston, is his own illegitimate son, and that the hold which Mrs. Quckett the housekeeper has over him arises from the fact that it was her daughter whom he had seduced, and who was the boy's mother. Not that it is at all clear why this should give Mrs. Quckett a hold over him. Then, as the story goes on, Irene further conceals from her husband the parentage of the little Tommy Brown, Myra's child, whom she adopts and so passionately loves; and, in fact, the whole book is founded on a kind of moral and personal hide-and-seek which is never broken into by voluntary self-revelation, but where discovery comes now from chance and now from sagacity.

No Intentions is curiously destitute of originality. All the materials are old, and all the situations have long been worn threadbare. The marriage of a gentleman with a girl of low birth, and the embarrassing advent of an "honourable Tommy" in consequence; the marriage of a pretty young woman with one man while she is desperately in love with another; the return of the lover into the sphere of that pretty young woman, now a wife, still in love, and still beloved; the jealousy of the formerly unsuspecting husband, whose fears and fancies are worked on by a female demon who has her grip on him, and makes him feel it; the passionate outburst of affection between the two lovers, coming to mutual explanations when too late, and sailing very near to danger in the process; the timely removal of the obstructing conjugalities on both sides, and the happy union of the hitherto unhappy turtle-doves—in all this we do not find one strong or striking situation, nor the faintest attempt at anything like originality. But what we freely allow to be original is Mrs. Ross Church's idea of her own craft. We give the passage at full length; it would be a pity to curtail it:—

Have you ever watched the process of knitting one of your own socks? I appeal, of course, to my masculine readers. If you have, I am sure it appeared a very incomprehensible sort of business to you, and, until it ap-

peared in its proper person, you would have been puzzled to decide how on earth it was ever going to turn into a sock at all. The first few rows, with the exception of a stitch added here or decreased there, go smoothly enough; but when it comes to the toe and heel crisis it is apparently all inextricable confusion until the last stitch is knitted and the worker *casts off*. Knitting a sock and unravelling the plot of a sensational novel are two very similar things. It has been difficult at times, I dare say, to trace the reason of some of the actions in this present story, and the "toe and heel crisis" was, I think, a "regular stumper," but I trust that all has been explained to the satisfaction of the reader.

There is nothing more perilous for a writer to venture upon than a frank confession of the faults and foibles of women. To say that they are mercenary, fast, untruthful, or what not, is to have the whole sex for one's enemies; and to hint that they sometimes indulge in certain bad habits, as undue alcoholism, for example, is to be inevitably branded as a slanderer. But it would seem that Mrs. Ross Church's experience in this last particular fully bears out the assertions of the worst calumniators of the sex. When Irene is undergoing her disappointment she flies to the bottle for solace. This is a rough way of translating Mrs. Ross Church's more indirect information. "She is harder than she used to be—more cynical, less open to belief in truth and virtue. Added to which her appetite is variable, and she drinks wine feverishly, almost eagerly, and at odd intervals of time." We have read some wonderful things in women's novels before now, but anything more naïve than this matter-of-fact description of the nascent dipsomania of a young lady crossed in love we have certainly never encountered. We can only hope that, like Azamat-Batuk's famous Miss Lucy, it is an exception rather than the rule; and that the Irenes of society who "drink wine eagerly" and "at odd intervals of time," because a man who has flirted with them has declared off and pleaded "no intentions," are very few and very far between. Nor do we endorse Mrs. Ross Church's sweeping assertion that the women "who pretend they cannot tell when a man is in love with them" are necessarily "either fools or hypocrites." An old hand would certainly know; the married women, for instance, who, safely intrenched behind the security of their position, pass their lives in weaving nets for the silly flies buzzing round them, and who consequently are acquainted with the whole grammar of fascination, from the first "glowing look" to the last passionate declaration—there would be no mistake with them sure enough; but many women are not so knowing, and, without being fools or hypocrites, can be taken unawares by the confession which every one but themselves saw was inevitable.

There are many other things which offend our taste in this book; and the instances of bad style and vulgar sentiment in it are almost innumerable. "Humility is Christian, but in a world of business it does not pay," is one of the author's aphorisms. "There comes Mr. Walmsley and his bundle of papers" is by no means an isolated example of her peculiar ideas on grammar; her preference for bedroom scenes with her married couples is also singular, to say the least. We confess that we do not like her work. We find it more flippant than smart, more audacious than clever; and we think her own parallel of sock-knitting about the most appropriate that can be applied to it.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

M. FOUILLÉE'S valuable and exhaustive work on Socrates* begins with a comparative estimate of the merits of Plato and Xenophon as authorities respecting the life of their master. German critics have expressed the opinion that neither the *Memorabilia* of the latter nor the Dialogues of the former are altogether safe sources of information; M. Fouillée believes this view to be an exaggeration, and contends that it is always easy to find where Xenophon and Plato have added to the doctrine of Socrates, and where they give a faithful representation of it. If we wish to study in Socrates chiefly the metaphysician, we must not consult the author of the *Memorabilia*. Xenophon, says M. Fouillée, was utterly deficient in what may be called *le sens philosophique*; he professedly aims at portraying in his master, not the philosophical reformer, but the citizen, little disposed to innovations and faithful to the religious traditions of his country. Plato, on the other hand, applies himself almost exclusively to the intellectual biography of Socrates, and in so doing adds considerably to the theories he endeavours to explain. This difficulty may, however, says M. Fouillée, be easily overcome by attentive study of the Platonic Dialogues, for in these works the respective shares of the disciple and the teacher are really, though unconsciously, marked out, and the contrast presented by several of these compositions enables us to trace the boundary line with a considerable approach to accuracy. Plato and Xenophon complete one another, therefore, as biographers of Socrates, and to their evidence we must add that of Aristotle, which has hitherto been too much neglected. M. Fouillée devotes two large octavo volumes to an inquiry into the philosophy of Socrates; and if we consider the revolutions which that philosophy accomplished, we shall not be surprised at the development given by our author to his monograph. Dialectics, ethics, politics, theology, aesthetics, all these various topics are fully discussed, and the amount of research brought to bear upon them justifies the honour which the Académie des Sciences morales et politiques conferred upon M. Fouillée when they rewarded him with one of the prizes at their disposal.

* *La philosophie de Socrate*. Par A. Fouillée. Paris: Germer-Baillière.

La Rochefoucauld * is, from different points of view, one of the chief French writers of the seventeenth century, and his works could not but occupy a distinguished place in Messrs. Hachette's *Collection des grands écrivains*. It is by his *Maxims* that he is known to most readers, and many a battle has been fought on the subject of a code of philosophy which assigns the origin of all our actions to selfishness. M. Victor Cousin, carried away by his passion for Madame de Longueville, had come to regard La Rochefoucauld almost in the light of a personal enemy, whilst Sainte-Beuve, delighted to find an occasion of attacking the champion of French eclecticism, entered the lists on the other side. Unfortunately, in the case of La Rochefoucauld as well as of the other great writers of the Louis XIV. period, the texts at our disposal were hitherto extremely imperfect; thanks to M. Gilbert, and, since his death, to his coadjutor, M. Gourdault, the deficiency is now supplied, and we have another name to place on the list of French writers who can be studied in an edition worthy of them. The first volume contains, besides portraits of La Rochefoucauld by himself and by the Cardinal de Retz, all the *Maxims* arranged in their proper order, and followed by an excellent analytical index. M. Gourdault has judiciously added an amusing collection of *testimonia* from Madame de la Fayette, Madame de Sablé, and other contemporaries; amongst them we find two fables of La Fontaine, an article of the *Journal des savants*, &c. In the second volume we have La Rochefoucauld's memoirs, together with the *Apologie pour M. le prince de Massillac*, revised from a careful collation of the best MSS.; a biographical memoir of the Duke is announced for publication in a subsequent instalment.

M. Maine de Biran † was one of the leaders of modern French spiritualism in philosophy. At a time when Condillac still ruled supreme amongst our neighbours, and when De Tracy, Brousseau, and Cabanis thought that the famous proposition "nihil est in intellectu quod non prius fuerit in sensu" was to be the definite motto of all ideologists, a rebellion broke out in the sensationalist camp, and Maine de Biran placed himself, with Royer Collard, at the head of the disaffected. Some of his writings were published after his death, by M. Cousin; others appeared under the editorship of M. Ernest Naville, and amongst these not the least curious was a kind of journal or autobiography extending from 1794 to 1824. This interesting document, showing the gradual transition of a thinker from Condillacism to Christianity, appeared for the first time in 1859; the new edition now announced is augmented by the insertion of a few family letters which give fresh value to the narrative of an interesting life.

The elegant little volume for which we are indebted to M. Jules Girard ‡ is devoted chiefly to an estimate of Lysias and Hyperides. The name of the former is connected with the most decisive, if not the most brilliant, epoch of Hellenic eloquence—that, namely, in which, casting away all foreign influence, it assumed its true character, and appeared in all its originality. M. Girard has treated the subject of Lysias in a very piquant and interesting manner, combining with the life of his hero a number of archaeological details respecting Greek forensic eloquence. Hyperides occupies the greater part of the book, and the part which concerns him is a revised reprint of three articles contributed to the *Revue nationale* and the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. M. Girard begins giving the biography of Hyperides and a sketch of his career as an orator; he then discusses the celebrated discourse edited in England by Professor Churchill Babington, and concludes by an account of the scandalous case of bribery and corruption in which Demosthenes was implicated. M. Girard remarks that the condemnation of this illustrious man is an instance of the stern and absolute despotism exercised by the republics of antiquity, and which was the very condition of their existence.

The *Bibliothèque élévirienne* begun with so much spirit and talent by the late M. Jannet is, we are happy to say, still going on; the last two instalments are the complete works of Mellin de Saint-Gelays, and the facetiae published under the name of Eutrapel, by Noël du Fail, seigneur de La Hérissey. We noticed the first volume of the former writer § at the time when it was issued, and we were able highly to commend the manner in which it was edited; we can also speak well of the concluding volumes, which give us, amongst other things, several pieces which had never yet been printed. The analytical index at the end will be found of great use, for the persons mentioned by Saint-Gelays, or to whom his poems are inscribed, form a very considerable list, and we may almost say that all the celebrities of the sixteenth century appear in it. Together with Ronsard and Remi Belleau, he occupies a very prominent rank in the Renaissance movement, and it is well that a really good edition should enable us to study the works of a man whose writings, although not exactly characterized by genius, are agreeable and full of imagination.

The *Contes rustiques* and *Baliverneries* of the pseudonymous Eutrapel || belong to a class of works which flourished to a con-

siderable extent towards the end of the fifteenth century and during the whole of the sixteenth. Rabelais's *Gargantua* was the principal representative of those *livres de haute gresse*, which are fit only for a limited class of readers, but are interesting as giving us a photograph of society, and also as being the source from which subsequent authors drew largely. Eutrapel has found a conscientious editor in M. Assézat, and his admirers will not now be driven to consult rare volumes accessible only to those who can frequent the British Museum or the Paris Bibliothèque nationale.

M. Lemerre, like M. Jannet, deserves well of the lovers of old French literature. After having given us an excellent *Montaigne*, a *Ronsard*, and a *D'Aubigné*, he goes a little further back, and treats us to an edition of *Charles d'Orléans*.* This elegant poet cannot claim the honour of being regarded as an original writer, and the student who examines closely the volume just published by M. C. d'Héricault will find at almost every step traces of imitation both in style and in ideas. The *maniére* tone of the *Roman de la rose*, the delicacy and gracefulness of Thibault de Champagne, the subtlety of Petrarch, all contributed to shape the talent of Charles d'Orléans; and yet he possesses a merit of his own, and at any rate he deserves attention as the last representative of the spirit of chivalry; his works form a transition between the middle ages and the Renaissance.

Few ladies in the history of the French eighteenth century deserve to be known as much as the Duchess de Choiseul †, and M. Grasset has done well in endeavouring to sketch her attractive portrait. His volume does not contain anything precisely new, but he has turned to excellent account the innumerable collections of letters which have been handed down to us, especially that of Madame du Deffard. M. Grasset divides his work into three periods; the first of which includes the time of the Duke de Choiseul's public life from 1755 to 1770. As Ambassador and as Minister he exercised a wonderful amount of influence in the history of his country, and we may say of Europe; his liberal principles had made him extremely popular with the nation, whilst they secured to him the hatred of the unworthy favourites who ruled at Versailles under the King's name. Obliged at last to yield to the caprices of Madame Du Barry, Choiseul retired, and spent a four years' exile on his estates at Chanteloup. This period forms the second part of M. Grasset's book, whilst the third relates the residence of Madame de Choiseul in Paris during the reign of Louis XVI., and ends with her life in 1801. It is much to be regretted that the author of this otherwise interesting and carefully written work should not have extended his researches a little more widely; for instance, that he should have entirely neglected Soulavie's *Mémoires du duc de Choiseul*, where he would have found a number of piquant and authentic anecdotes, besides several letters of the Duchess.

Amongst the many institutions created by Louis XIV. there is one which has never yet occupied the attention of historians. Except an article in the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie des beaux-arts*, a few papers in M. Pierre Clément's letters of Colbert, and a brief notice in M. Baltard's monograph of the Villa Medici, we have absolutely no record of the school of fine arts still existing at Rome †, the foundation of which is due to Colbert. And yet it cannot be said that materials are wanting for the preparation of such a work; there they are, but no one has ever thought of consulting them. If any inquisitive student takes the trouble to visit the part of the French State Paper Office known by the name of Maison du Roi, he will find there the almost complete series of correspondence addressed by the directors of the Académie de France to their immediate superior, the Surintendant des bâtiments de la couronne. The letters collected in this set of documents give year by year, and almost day by day, a narrative of what has taken place, not only at the Académie, but in the city of Rome, and the abundant details transmitted to Paris by the various directors throw great light both upon general history and upon the development and vicissitudes of Colbert's useful foundation. Although the correspondence belonging to that statesman's administration no longer exists except in the most fragmentary condition, M. Lecoy de la Marche, the compiler of the volume before us, has been able to supply the deficiency from other sources, and from the year 1687 the series goes on consecutively until the disorganization of the Académie in 1792. M. Lecoy de la Marche could not very easily reproduce the whole collection of letters; he has limited himself to those bearing upon the fine arts, and has thus given us a work which is entirely new and full of valuable information. By way of preface, he explains the whole progress of the French School of Fine Arts at Rome, and this historical introduction is, so to say, the text on which the letters form the comment. He has added much subsidiary information in the shape of foot-notes and a copious index.

The war of 1870-71 is still the subject of numerous commentaries. The *Paris Journal* has undertaken to publish a cheap but complete edition of the *procès-verbaux* and reports issued by the Committee organized on the 14th June, 1871, to examine the proceedings both of the Government of the National Defence and of the Commune. It would be impossible and unnecessary to reprint all these documents *in extenso*, but still, in abridging them, no necessary fact need be left out, no material evidence neglected. It is in this sense that the collections published by the *Paris*

* *Oeuvres complètes de la Rochefoucauld*. Publié par MM. Gilbert et Gourdault. Vols. 1 and 2. Paris and London: L. Hachette & Co.

† *Maine de Biran, sa vie et ses pensées*. Par Ernest Naville. 2^e édition. Paris: Didier.

‡ *Études sur l'éloquence attique*. Par Jules Girard. Paris and London: L. Hachette & Co.

§ *Oeuvres complètes de Mellin de Saint-Gelays*. Publié par M. P. Blanchefain. Vols. 2, 3. Paris: Daffis.

|| *Oeuvres facétieuses de Noël du Fail*. Publié par J. Assézat. Vol. 1. Paris: Daffis.

* *Oeuvres complètes de Ch. d'Orléans*. Publié par C. d'Héricault. Vol. 1.

† *Madame de Choiseul et son temps*. Par J. Grasset. Paris: Didier.

‡ *L'Académie de France à Rome; correspondance de ses directeurs*. Publié par A. Lecoy de la Marche. Paris: Didier.

Journal profess to be complete; moreover, in certain cases, the comparative brevity of the documents to be printed may enable the editors to give them without any alterations; and this has been the case as regards the Report on the camp of Conlie and the army of Brittany.*

M. de la Borderie, the author of the popular publication we have just noticed, has treated the same subject in a separate pamphlet addressed to scientific readers. Not only does he revise the text of the official Report, correct misprints, and rectify numerous blunders, but he adds a copious appendix including various *pièces justificatives*, details which the author of the Report had not known, and answers to the objections raised by certain newspapers against parts of the Report itself.

M. Rolin's volume is another contribution to the history of the war.† The troops which acted in Normandy had not hitherto had their monograph, perhaps because their commanders having been repeatedly changed, not one of these gentlemen thought that his tenure of office had been long enough to justify him in writing the history of the campaign. The Normandy National Guards, left very much to themselves, and obliged to carry on their share of the war in a rather desultory manner, did not indeed perform any operations of sufficient importance to stand out in history side by side with the engagements at Gravelotte or at Mars-la-Tour. They were not incorporated either with the army of the Loire or with that of the North, and they never had the opportunity of distinguishing themselves under Chanzy or Faidherbe; but they honourably and conscientiously discharged the duties assigned to them, and they deserved to find a faithful historian. M. Rolin's volume is not the least valuable addition to the military library published by M. Plon. It is illustrated with a beautiful map of Western France.

Under the title *Autorité et liberté*‡ M. Latour du Moulin has published in two duodecimos a collection of political articles the perusal of which might be useful under present circumstances. In his preface, after defining the position of the Conservative-Liberal party, he goes on to contend that the Imperial Government was about to move in that direction if the fatal war of 1870 had not adjourned *sine die* the peaceful solution of home political questions. He then examines the often discussed question as to the real author of the campaign, and he is inclined to divide the responsibility between the Emperor and the nation. This solution seems to us the true one, and amongst the innumerable details connected with the whole affair, we may notice, as M. Latour du Moulin does, the injudicious interpellation of M. Codery on the 5th of July. It is tolerably clear that if the negotiations relative to the Spanish Crown had remained secret, they would probably have ended in kind of understanding with the Cabinet of Berlin; at all events they might have lasted long enough to secure for France the active co-operation of Austria and Italy. Our author is severe in his judgment of the revolutionary leaders, and he accuses M. Gambetta especially of having sacrificed patriotism to ambition. But we have dwelt long enough on the preface to these volumes; the work itself consists of an elaborate parallel between the political systems of France and England, followed by a narrative of the principal sittings of the *Cours Législatif* in which M. Latour du Moulin took an active part, beginning with January 12th, 1864, and ending with August 27, 1870.

M. Honoré Bonhomme, to whom we owe many interesting works on the history of French society in the eighteenth century, has just published from numerous documents§, some of which are still but little known, an account of the family of Louis XV. About the King himself it would be difficult to say anything very new; his mistresses, Madame de Pompadour and Madame Du Barry, are familiar to the reader in every detail of their eventful career; for, unfortunately, wherever there is a spice of scandal, public curiosity is sure to be on the alert. But in the Court of Versailles during the reign of Louis XV. there were four princesses whose influence often told with decided weight, and the ladies to whom their father had given, at the instigation of his mistresses, the *sobriquets* of Corse, Loque, Graille, and Chiffe, were not the colourless nonentities that some persons suppose. The memoirs of the Marquis d'Argenson and the Duke de Luynes had already made this fact sufficiently clear; and M. Honoré Bonhomme now produces fresh proofs of it. His work is divided into seven chapters devoted respectively to the Dauphin and to the six daughters of the King; then comes an appendix of documents, including a number of letters from the princesses, never yet published.

The twelfth volume of Saint-Simon's *Memoirs*|| opens with the character of Louis XIV. and closes with that of the Regent, two of the most striking parts of a work which never loses its interest although we turn to it for the twentieth time. Voltaire described in his *Siècle de Louis XIV.* the fair side of a wonderful reign; Saint-Simon lets us see things as they really were, and his character of the monarch is one which the verdict of posterity has amply confirmed. If, as he tells us, Louis XIV. was systematic-

cally kept by his Ministers without the means of becoming acquainted with the nation, the Duke d'Orléans in like manner placed between himself and France a barrier of *roués* and abandoned women. He was an almost unequalled instance of superior talents completely frittered away, and of natural kindness of disposition blunted by the grossest vices.

Amongst the scientific publications before us we may mention the seventeenth instalment* of the great dictionary of chemistry for which we are indebted to Mr. Wurtz; it includes important and valuable articles on Platinum, Phosphorus, and Photography.

MM. André and Royet have done good service in issuing their neat little volume on the history of English astronomical observatories.† The first chapter gives a full account of the establishment at Greenwich, together with biographical memoranda of Flamsteed, Halley, Bradley, Maskelyne, &c. The Universities come next; Kew and Liverpool supply the materials for the third chapter; and, finally, we have a description of the principal private observatories throughout the kingdom. An appendix is devoted to the Savilian building at Oxford, and the whole work is copiously illustrated with excellent woodcuts. It is curious to see from the preface that France, which before the Revolution took the lead in astronomical investigations, and boasted of upwards of thirty observatories of various degrees of importance, at present numbers only three, whilst all the other Continental States and England have not only outstripped her, but advanced far beyond the position which they themselves occupied eighty years ago. We shall wait with much curiosity for the sequel of this useful work.

Anthropological questions are just now the order of the day, and Dr. Topinard's publication‡ is a kind of guide for those who may feel disposed to explore the northern part of Africa for the purpose of studying the various races of men settled there. It contains, besides some introductory remarks by General Faidherbe, a number of hints and indications from Dr. Topinard's able pen. They are concise, clearly put, founded upon the personal observations of scientific travellers, and completed by useful bibliographical notes.

If we now pass to the realms of fiction we must own to some feeling of embarrassment in mentioning what is generally considered as the great success of the past month; we mean M. Flaubert's *Tentation de Saint-Antoine*.§ Should any of our readers be attracted towards it by the reputation of the author of *Madame Bovary*, he will probably be amused on learning that for twenty-seven years this work has been anxiously expected, and that, compared with it, Goethe's *Faust* sinks into absolute insignificance. To our mind, the *Tentation* is simply the nightmare of an author whose imagination revels in foulness, and who, under the pretence of writing up Pantheism, courts popularity by the most odious means.

The Swiss *Bibliothèque universelle* for May || abounds in articles of general interest; let us mention M. Rambert's paper on Modern Metaphysics, and the second part of M. Ernest Lehr's essay on Woman's Rights. The letters of the Princess Palatine, edited by M. Jules Chavannes, and concluded in this number, throw much additional light upon the Court of Versailles during the second half of the reign of Louis XIV.

* *Dictionnaire de Chimie*. Publié par M. Wurtz. 17^e livraison. Paris and London: L. Hachette & Co.

† *L'Astronomie pratique et les observatoires*. Par C. André et G. Royet. Paris: Gauthier-Villars.

‡ *Instructions sur l'anthropologie de l'Algérie*. Par le général Faidherbe et le docteur Topinard. Paris: Germer-Baillière.

§ *La tentation de Saint Antoine*. Par Gustave Flaubert. Paris: Charpentier.

|| *Bibliothèque universelle et Revue suisse*. Mai 1874. Lausanne, Bridel.

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected Communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF NO. 971, JUNE 6, 1874:

M. Gambetta at Auxerre.
Mr. Anderson's Motion. The Army. Spain.
The Archbishops in Committee. M. Ledru Rollin and Universal Suffrage.
The Protection of British Subjects. The Licensing Bill.
Ratepayers and Communicants.

Royal Dukes.
Chamouni Guides. Female Suffrage.
The Farm Labourers' Catechism. The Old Catholic Synod. Hospital Sunday.
Adulteration. The Royal Academy—V.
The Derby.

Cairnes's Political Economy.
Swinburne's *Bothwell*. Motley's Life of Barneveld.
Aileen Ferrers. Bell's British Quadrupeds. Cooks and Cookery.
Adams's History of Japan. No Intentions.
French Literature.

* *Le camp de Conlie et l'armée de Bretagne*. Rapport par M. de la Borderie. Paris: Plon.

† *La guerre dans l'ouest*. Par L. Rolin. Paris: Plon.

‡ *Autorité et liberté*. Par M. Latour du Moulin. Paris and London: L. Hachette & Co.

§ *Louis XIV. et sa famille, d'après des lettres et des documents inédits*. Par Honoré Bonhomme. Paris: Dentu.

|| *Mémoires du duc de Saint-Simon*. Vol. 12. Paris and London: L. Hachette & Co.